GLIMPSES OF THE FUTURE

SUGGESTIONS AS TO THE DRIFT OF THINGS

BY

DAVID GOODMAN CROLY

(TO BE READ NOW AND JUDGED IN THE YEAR 2000)

NEW YORK & LONDON
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
The Knickerbocker Press
1888

COPYRIGHT BY
DAVID GOODMAN CROLY
1888

Press of
G. P. Putnam's Sons
New York

UTOPIA
REP
C

THIS WORK
IS
DEDICATED TO
CLINTON W. SWEET
MY BEST AND KINDEST FRIEND, WHO FIRST
SUGGESTED ITS COMPILATION

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
AN INITIAL TALK	3
OUR POLITICAL FUTURE	7
OUR POLITICAL FUTURE—*Continued*	18
OUR COMING FOREIGN POLICY	32
POSSIBILITIES IN THE WAY OF PARTY ORGANIZATIONS	38
RELIGIOUS CHANGES OF THE FUTURE	43
THE RELATION OF THE SEXES	48
IMPROVING THE RACE	55
THE SECRET OF THE JEWISH RACE	62
A DISCURSIVE CHAPTER	69
IS A UNIVERSAL LANGUAGE POSSIBLE?	79
THE PROSPECT FOR ARCHITECTURE	87
CONCEITS ABOUT THE CURRENCY	93
TRUSTS, CORPORATIONS, AND GOVERNMENT WORK	99
WHAT WILL BECOME OF THE MIDDLE CLASSES?	105
ANENT THE LABOR QUESTION	110
AS TO IRRIGATION	116
JOURNALISM AS IT IS AND WILL BE	122
A BODY OF CENSORS PROPOSED	129
THE FATE OF THE NEGRO	133
THE TENDENCIES OF EDUCATION	139
THE DESTINY OF NEW YORK CITY	144
WHAT SCIENCE HAS IN STORE FOR US	151
TRAVELLING THROUGH THE AIR	156
THE UTILIZATION OF DREAMS	161
SOME ODD CONCEITS	167
A WORD WITH A CRITIC	174

GLIMPSES OF THE FUTURE.

INTRODUCTION.

THE author of this work was fortunate enough to predict in 1871 the panic of 1873, designating the railroad corporation which would first come to grief and the banking house which would probably be the first to suspend payment. He was also rather lucky in guessing the probable result of elections. This ability to forecast the future in a certain way was of use to him when managing a leading daily paper in New York. When ill-health forced him to give up daily journalism, his friend, Clinton W. Sweet, invited him to do some editorial writing on the *Record and Guide*. A "Prophetic Department" was commenced, in which an attempt was made to forecast the future of business and politics. As it would not do to commit either the writer or the paper to authoritative statements, subjects were treated in a rather off-hand manner by a "Sir Oracle," the name, of course, implying that the writer was probably a bumptious sort of person, who was as likely to be wrong as right. The department proved attractive to the readers of the *Record and Guide*, and the predictions were often fortunate. Indeed so much interest was thus created that the publisher was frequently asked: Would it not be possible to print in

some permanent form such of the vaticinations of "Sir Oracle" as related to the remote future, or to the tendency and drift of things? Of course much of the matter in the "Prophetic Department" was on current themes and had no permanent interest. In the following pages there is considerable new matter. Practically, the conversations have been re-written, and those which have been retained have been edited and grouped under appropriate heads. It is "Sir Oracle" who still answers the questions, but had the work been written *de novo* that name would not have been used, as it suggests a flippancy and self-sufficiency hardly befitting the scope of the subjects discussed.

D. G. C.

AN INITIAL TALK.

READER.—So you propose to tell us something about the future? Is that practicable? Would it be desirable that we should know beforehand what is to take place in the world we live in? I can see that there would be a mighty change in our lives and in the history of the world if our "fore sight" was equal to our "hind sight." But is not nature wise in hiding from us the secrets of the days to come?

AUTHOR.—I have no notion of being able to tell what the future has in store for us. The best we can do is to indicate the drift of things. Possibilities, and not certainties, are all we can hope for in speculating upon to-morrow and the day after. Unconsciously we do order our lives upon some theory of the future. We educate our children so they shall pursue a certain career either in business or in the professions. Every merchant and manufacturer buys goods or makes them, upon some theory as to their value when the time to dispose of them comes. Sagacity in business means a certain kind of prevision. It has seemed to me that this faculty of looking ahead has not been cultivated as it should have been, and this book has been written with a view to turning men's thoughts from dwelling so much on the past and present, and inducing them to think out what is likely to occur hereafter.

READER.—But surely there can be no certainty in such speculations. The average man has not patience enough for such investigations, and the clever, ingenious, imaginative man would most certainly become the victim of his own theories and illusions. I cannot see any data which would make prophecy reasonable, and of course you do not claim inspiration.

AUTHOR.—I claim to be guided only by experience and ordinary common-sense. I shall make very grave, and what will seem to my readers twenty years from now, unaccountable mistakes, but I hope to call into existence a class of thinkers and writers, who will do far better than I with my present environment can hope to do. They should profit by my blunders. The test of science is said to be prevision. The astronomer can tell to a second the beginning of an eclipse a thousand years ahead. The chemist makes no mistakes; when he puts together certain atoms of matter, he knows and announces beforehand what the result will be. It may be air or water or an explosive, but he is never at fault. Of course there can be no such certainty in predicting social phenomena, for the factors are so complex that unexpected results are sure to make their appearance. Nevertheless there are certain tendencies in history, which may give us some clew to the hereafter. It is this ground I propose to occupy. I expect to be at fault in many important matters; but if I can induce men to think of consequences I shall have done what may be a useful work.

READER.—What do you consider the most dangerous pit-falls likely to beset a social prophet?

AUTHOR.—The most serious difficulty in speculating as to the future is the liability to imagine Utopias. From the "Republic" of Plato down to Edward Bellamy's

"Looking Backward," all writers have indulged their fancy for ideal social states. We all know that the world might be a great deal better than it is; and most of us have theories as to how the affairs of men could be better managed than they are, and insensibly we portray an imaginary state of things, instead of confining ourselves to the data afforded by the past experience of the race. Although the mass of mankind has made advances over the past, still, history shows that there has been retrogression as well as progression. The races that were once dominant, such as the Egyptians, Grecians, and Romans, have fallen to the rear, while the barbarians of their times have come to the front. One word of caution. This conversation would seem to imply that my ambition was to give a general philosophy of history; my aim is far more modest. I propose simply to take up such matters as are of everyday importance, and try to think out the future with regard to them. This will involve such questions as marriage, wealth and poverty, the tendencies of business, modern finance, the good and evil in our American institutions, as well as some guesses as to the future history of Europe. I should like, also, to give you another warning before I begin scraping my little hole through the fence which separates us from the future. You will find but small unity of construction either in the book as a whole or in each separate conversation. And this discursiveness is a necessary accompaniment to a work designed as this is. I have not intended to be in any way exhaustive. I only wish to offer a few suggestions on the future aspect of current topics; and if you are not at any time able to see the connection between one of my suggestions and another, I can only give you as an excuse for my incoherency the old one that what

is intended to create thought should never exhaust it. Emerson was once asked what connection there was between two parts of one of his discourses. "None, friend," he answered, "except in the mind of God." I am afraid that in reading the following you will have to depend much on the mind of God. As I have said, the separate pieces have no unity of construction; only unity of design. Like a lot of logs, they all float down stream; but often in so doing they will either clash together, or swing wide apart. In putting this book together, I am, I think, occupying new ground, and in a wilderness a few log cabins, tumble-down though they be, are pretty nearly as useful as a Queen Anne cottage, with all the "modern improvements." I offer you my huts. Seek shelter under them, if you will.

OUR POLITICAL FUTURE.

STATESMAN.—As our country has just about reached its hundredth year, it strikes me that the time is a fit one to glance over our past constitutional history so as to see what light it may throw upon the future. Thus far we have safely weathered all the gales that outward interference and inward dissension could create. But are we to be so fortunate during the next hundred years? There have been great social and political changes in this country in the past; indeed, no nation has ever escaped them. We have every reason to believe, not only that these changes will continue in the future, but that they will be further reaching and more radical than any the world has yet seen. If this be true, some of the conditions that are to produce them must already be present to the eye of a discriminating observer. Can you point out any of them?

SIR ORACLE.—Here; wait a bit. You are going too fast. It is difficult to write about the earth in ten pages. Let me begin with your first question, and cast a rapid glance over the past,—a task that is rendered easy in view of a monologue, recently published by James Bryce, M.P., on the "Predictions of Hamilton and De Tocqueville." Sharpsighted as Hamilton and his contemporaries undoubtedly were, they made a sad mess of it in trying to point out the perils that threatened our

future. The opponents of the Constitution a hundred years ago predicted as the consequence to be expected from the creation of an effective Federal executive: (1) the destruction of the thirteen States as commonwealths; (2) the creation of a despot in the person of the President; (3) the creation of an oligarchy in the Senatorial body; (4) usurpation of executive functions, and divergence from the people on the part of the House of Representatives; (6) a tendency to provoke foreign wars. Hamilton's party, on the other hand, tried to avoid imaginary ills. The evils which they chiefly feared were: (1) the spirit and power of faction; (2) sudden impulses carrying the people away and inducing hasty and violent legislative measures; (3) instability in foreign policy; (4) ill-considered legislation; (5) the encroachment of the Legislature—and especially of the House, as the holder of the purse—upon the other departments; (6) a tendency on the part of the States to overbear the Federal Government; (7) the oppression of the minority by the majority; (8) State legislation threatening the validity of contracts and the security of property. It will be noted that the Federalists were much wiser in their vaticinations than were the Jeffersonian Democrats. The States-rights theory which Hamilton and his friends distrusted was the rock upon which the ship of state was nearly wrecked. The Democrats were altogether wrong in their general theories. Our own statesmen were not, however, the only ones who were wrong in their estimates of what was dangerous in our political institutions. Mr. Bryce also points out that De Tocqueville, with all his philosophic insight, his accuracy in stating facts, and his lucidity of style, failed entirely to foresee the real perils in the future of this country. He did not comprehend the

germs of States rights; nor did the subsequent growth of the spoils system come within his vision. He was blind to the influence of such important matters as our system of party organizations, the power of money in politics, of our close commercial relations in binding the States together, thus producing a national sentiment.

STATESMAN.—In view of the mistakes that such acute social philosophers as Hamilton and De Tocqueville have made in the past, it does not seem as if we pigmies of the present have much chance to succeed in a task in which they failed. Nevertheless, I judge that a man of our own day, who is willing to discard all personal preconceptions, and to investigate facts, as such, might be able to predict with a certain degree of accuracy our future perils, for, without any of the acuteness of De Tocqueville, he would be in possession of a mass of organized data which the former was necessarily without. The facts of history were sufficiently well known in the Frenchman's time, but they were not sufficiently well understood. Hence I think, Sir Oracle, with full consciousness that you are making use of glasses provided by others, that you may peek a little into the gloom that enshrouds our future.

SIR O.—I confess that the subject is one to which I have so often turned my attention, that I can talk, if not with confidence, at least with a certain degree of familiarity. And it is all the more necessary that it should be considered, because no one seems to think of giving it attention. All over the world, indeed, and in America quite as much as in other countries, modern changes of a social character are being carefully watched. To them I shall refer frequently. Just now I wish to confine myself to the political changes which are to be expected

within the limits of our own country. And as I say, the questions suggested by this head have hitherto been very largely disregarded. There seems to be a general tendency to let well enough alone, and to confine our political controversies to the tariff and free whiskey, matters with which, by this time, every American mind must be saturated. Our worship of our Constitution was and is a species of "fetich" worship.

STATESMAN.—Enough of this vague talk about change. Before it becomes worth any thing you must prove that changes are necessary.

SIR O.—That is not, I believe, a particularly difficult task. Does it seem probable that a Constitution which was constructed for a population of three or four millions scattered along the Atlantic seaboard, would remain equally well adapted to a population of 65,000,000, spread over a far wider area, and knit together as tightly as a prevailing community of interest renders possible.

STATESMAN.—Such changes as you speak of might indeed necessitate modification of our laws, but surely the vital principle which lies at the foundation of our Constitution, the principle that every human being possesses an inherent right to freedom,—surely, I say, that principle remains good and true, no matter how large may be our area, how numerous our population, or how close our community of interest.

SIR. O.—Your reply brings us to the root of the matter. That grand principle which you so confidently flaunt in my face, will not, I think, stand the test of criticism. It has been useful in its day; but its day is over. Undeniably the founders of our Constitution were impregnated with it; undeniably it has worked immense good in its time: and undeniably it contains within it the germ of a

far mightier truth. But the principle as it was understood by Jefferson was not a great principle at all; but a very small one. It was not a universal truth; but only a half truth, applicable merely to certain conditions. Our statesman got it from Rousseau; and with Rousseau it was merely negative. He saw, as Luther had seen before him, and as Goethe saw after him, that the great war of the future was the war for the liberation of humanity from the customs and opinions of the past. Unfortunately, however, Rousseau thought this principle meant emancipation from all relations, instead of merely emancipation from past relations. Hence he exalts the individual to the skies, and affirms the right of private judgment. Hence, too, he was the bitter enemy of any one who would limit the individual in any way, forgetting that it was not limitation as such that was undesirable, but only such limitations as were burdensome and ill-adapted to his conditions. This defect in Rousseau's principle has been pointed out recently by many different writers, and by none more effectively than Matthew Arnold, all of whose writings on social topics are simply vigorous polemics against the doctrine that men should be allowed to do as they like, instead of being taught to do as they ought. So much for the principle in general. In our own country it embodied itself in the practical maxim that "that government is best that governs least." The reason for this is obvious; the individual must not be subjected to what is called the political yoke.

STATESMAN.—Well! is not that true enough? The history of governmental legislation has been largely the history of a mass of gigantic errors. Recollect the mixture of pitiable inconsistency, unwarrantable interference, and unjustifiable oppression which passed for

governmental action in France before the Revolution. Is any other illustration necessary?

SIR O.—Yes! The example that you give to illustrate your point is not in itself sufficient. A thousand instances both of wise and unwise governmental action may be given. The question is one to be settled, not by instances, but by arguments. Oppression, undoubtedly, is a bad thing; but it can exist only where the interests of the governing classes differ from the interests of the people. Such was the state of affairs in France previous to the Revolution; but such is not the state of affairs at present, either in France or in the other civilized nations. That is to say, we have representative government to a greater or lesser degree over the larger part of Europe and all of America. Hence there is no danger that conditions will be such that the interest of the governors will differ in any radical way from the interests of the governed. It is true, just so long as selfishness exists in man, there will be acts of maladministration; but at the present time I do not think that such acts are either numerous enough or important enough to constitute a presumption against government action.

STATESMAN.—That is largely a matter of opinion. Mr. Herbert Spencer would probably think that in all doubtful cases there would be a presumption against governmental action. But, however that may be, I do not see why we need take the risk even of the acts of maladministration, which are confessedly unavoidable. Leave all doubtful cases to individual initiative, and thus the happiness of all will be procured by each pursuing his own.

SIR O.—Nonsense, the happiness of all can never be

procured by everybody acting for himself. If society consisted of a number of independent atoms without any essential connection one with another, then, indeed, the happiness of each would mean the happiness of all. It is scarcely necessary, however, to insist on the gratuitousness of any such assumption. Society is an organic unity. The individual finds his true development only in acting for the good of the whole; and if each acted for his trumpery little self only, war, not harmony, would result. Now, the function of government has largely been in the past to keep order within the state and to prevent aggression from without; hence the right of taxation and the right to organize the courts has never been denied the central authority. So much, at least, was necessary to secure the happiness of the people. Moreover, in my opinion, two or three hundred years ago, or even one hundred years ago, but very little more interference was necessary, much less advisable. But such is not the case now, for the whole tendency of our modern mechanical inventions has been to make society more and more of an organism and less and less of a mere aggregation of separate atoms.

STATESMAN.—After taking a breathing spell, will you explain that a little bit more in full.

SIR O.—I will try, for the point is essential to my argument. It amounts to this, viz.: that man is becoming more and more dependent on his fellows. And it follows from this that action by the individual and for the individual must become more and more limited in extent; or, to put it more correctly, state action must become more and more important and far reaching relative to the action of the individual. I have time to pause only over one instance to illustrate this.

Take the case of the railways. Their efficient and economical management concerns not the individual owners only, but the whole community. It is monstrous that these owners should be allowed to rob the people in the way they do. If our railways had been built economically, and had they been capitalized for the sum which they have cost, their earnings would fully suffice to pay five per cent. on the whole capital stock at half the present cost to the traveller and shipper. In other words, railways, telegraphs, and all corporate enterprises which deal with immense sums of capital have so important a social element in them, and a social element which is so constantly growing, that government action is bound to become more and more employed. I by no means want to imply that all government action must be right; but only that there is a growing presumption in its favor.

STATESMAN.—Your prediction is then that our government will become more and more paternal.

SIR O.—Yes; not only our government but all governments are taking on new and varied duties. When most of the nations were founded the king or emperor had very extensive powers. He led his armies, treated directly with foreign powers, was his own treasurer, and filled as far as possible all the functions of the State himself. But as time rolled by a prime-minister appeared to deal with foreign nations, then a treasurer to collect the taxes, a minister of justice in due time was recognized, and finally marshals and generals to lead the different armies. Compare, for instance, the cabinets of King Clovis and Louis XI. of France with that of the present French Republican government. You will find that the tendency is towards the multiplication of depart-

ments at the seat of governments as the nation grows. Notwithstanding his royal prerogatives how little real authority, for instance, had Edward I. of England, compared with a Gladstone or a Salisbury, the uncrowned kings of to-day. The cabinets of the latter represent nearly all the great interests of the nation. Notice how we in the United States are steadily adding to the functions of the general government. We have now our educational, agricultural, statistical, weather, and other bureaus, not to speak of the Inter-State Commerce Commission, none of which were thought of in the time of Washington and Adams. Within a few years we will have cabinet secretaries, representing the larger interests of the nation, such as agriculture, transportation, and probably labor. The Blair education bill may not become a law while Grover Cleveland is President, but it is as certain as destiny that the education of the nation will finally be placed under the oversight of the central government.

STATESMAN.—As a matter of fact what you say is undoubtedly true. But in affirming that the tendency is a good one you have Herbert Spencer and many other philosophers against you.

SIR O.—It is the fact that I am insisting on at present. I appeal to the common-sense of our readers if it is not true that what may be called state socialism is gaining ground. It is within my own memory when the education of children was a family affair. When it was first proposed to tax the property of the state to educate all the children, rich old bachelors and spinsters as well as all large property-holders protested against the rank injustice of the matter. "Why," they asked, "should we be taxed to educate the children of the mass of the

community? This is state socialism pure and simple"; and so, indeed, it is! Then look at the roads of the country. It is not so many years since the toll-gate was to be found at every crossing, showing that they were private property; now they are free highways, made so by the state. Look at our public parks. The real estate of the rich is taxed to furnish new pleasure grounds for those who have no property. The dispensaries give not only medical advice but medicines to the poor free of charge. The art galleries of the world are thrown open to everybody, and the very palaces of the kings in Europe are no longer their own, but are free to the multitude and serve as local museums and places of popular resort.

STATESMAN.—But is not Herbert Spencer justified in protesting against this absorption of authority by the central powers? This state socialism or paternalism, does it not destroy local self-government and paralyze individual initiative? In other words, if the head gets too big will not the limbs be atrophied?

SIR O.—The great evolutionist should have paid more attention to the lessons of his own studies in biology. From that science he would learn that as the head of the animal enlarges its limbs become more alive; in other words, the whole organism grows more active. Every new function in the body of the animal has its corresponding nerve centre in the brain, and this is what is taking place in all civilized nations. The local circulation is stimulated, not weakened, by the increased activity of the brain. The individual bee is the better protected because the good of the hive is the first consideration of every colony of honey-makers. Herbert Spencer, when a very young man, had the misfortune to write a book entitled "Social Statics," in which he committed himself fully

to the Manchester school of political economy. These writers saw only half a truth, and Mr. Spencer's philosophy, as applied to government and business, is consequently as hopelessly wrong as was the Ptolemaic astronomy. The Democratic party, in following the *ignis-fatuus* of State-rights—that is, of home rule as against Federal authority,—nearly wrecked the nation in the great civil war. In truth the municipalities and the State are more powerful than ever they were, nothwithstanding the growing paternalism of the central government.

OUR POLITICAL FUTURE.

Continued.

STATESMAN.—Well! we dwelt some time on the first topic we started, Sir Oracle, suppose we try to be more specific and brief now. What is the most important political danger that you fear?

SIR ORACLE.—The lack of flexibility in our Constitution. It is almost impossible to change it, except, as I have said, under the stress of some great calamity. England is lucky in having no written Constitution. An act of Parliament enables the government to meet any emergency; but our methods of amendment are so dilatory, and so difficult is it to get our people to act together, that our governmental machine is getting out of repair. It is impossible to make its various parts conform to existing conditions.

STATESMAN.—Specify some of the defects in our Constitution?

SIR O.—Well, take our Electoral College. Originally that was intended to be a real deliberative body. It was to choose a President for the people. But in practice the College obeys the behests of the party Conventions. These great organizations, which determine who shall be the candidates, are utterly unknown to our Constitution. They are extra-legal, but none the less potent for all that.

STATESMAN.—What other trouble do you see in the future?

SIR O.—There are too many questions involved in that inquiry to do them all justice in a short conversation. I might mention cursorily the practical denial of justice in our courts. In an age of steam and lightning communication our tedious legal forms waste the time and money of a very busy people. Our Supreme Court is three years and a half behind its business. Every murderer can now have two or three trials. Thus time is wasted and costs continue to increase. By-and-by the people will not stand it, and a social convulsion may result.

STATESMAN.—Any thing else?

SIR O.—The growth of corporate power is another serious matter. The recent discussions as to trusts and other great monopolies throw a great deal of light on that subject. Then the accumulation of wealth in a few hands, which is steadily going on, will unquestionably lead to a grave agitation which may have vital consequences on the future of the country. I am quite sure that the American of the twentieth century will not consent to live under a merely selfish plutocracy.

STATESMAN.—You have said nothing about the spoils system?

SIR O.—That was one of the curses of the past, and will trouble us for some time in the future. But the tendency in this country is toward civil-service reform. The politicians of both parties do not like any change from the old bad ways, but the public sentiment of the nation insists upon it, and before the close of this century I expect to see our civil service as honest and as efficient as our military and naval services have always been. Moreover, the adoption of the Australian system of voting will do much to purify our elections.

STATESMAN.—But these changes are generally of rather small importance.

SIR O.—I know it. So I pass from these merely political questions to the social questions that underly them. Our Constitution would not need to be flexible, if our social state would forever remain the same. The time for radical changes must come; and such changes cannot be brought about under our Constitution. Hence I think that a new constitution is inevitable some time. How radical the changes will be I cannot pretend to say. The necessity for some readjustment of the relations between capital and labor will, I think, bring them about. I do not believe the poor are growing poorer, though I do hold that the very rich will become still richer. It is the middle class which will become reduced in numbers. A few of the brainiest or the more lucky will find their way into the ranks of the very rich, but the great bulk of them will be forced down into the artisan class. They will leaven the mass of workingmen, and the latter will be greatly benefited by the energy and leadership of their former employers. The nineteenth-century industrial machinery has failed in one particular. The mass of the working class have not profited as much as they should have done by the wonderful improvements in the mechanic arts. A disproportionate share of the saving effected by improved machinery has gone to the capitalist class. Of course the workers are better fed, housed, and clothed, have shorter hours and more comforts than their forefathers, who lived earlier in the century, and before the application of steam to industrial processes. But the working people have had a trying time of it, due to the displacement of their labor by mechanical invention. But I am in hopes that the twentieth century will

see this wrong righted; still I fear that there is a social war ahead of us before the final compromise is effected.

STAESMAN.—But what shape will it take? What will be the cause and the occasion of this social disturbance?

SIR O.—Heretofore we have had a safety-valve in the cheap lands of the West; there was always a certain portion of the most provident workingmen who could go to the soil for sustenance when employment was slack in the manufacturing centres. Within a quarter of a century there will be no more cheap land, while large additions will be made to the centres of population. The ranks of labor will be augmented and acute distress will be prevalent during the frequent commercial crises. Hence the danger of angry mobs of discontented workpeople.

STATESMAN.—I judge that time is further off than you think. There has yet been little appreciable rise in the price of Southern farm-lands. There are millions of acres of arable soil in the northern zone of the Southern States which have yet to be occupied. Then in the far West irrigating canals are being dug to utilize vast regions which have been heretofore regarded as deserts. Now one of the peculiarities of irrigated lands is that but few acres are sufficient for the work of the husbandman; he gets as large crops from thirty or forty acres as the farmer who depends on rain does from 160 acres. California is destined to have a dense population, because a family can be supported on ten acres of soil. Of course the time must arrive when the country will be overpopulated; but will not science come to our aid and so multiply food products as to give every one an abundance at a minimum price? Is not the tendency towards cheapness in every thing?

SIR O.—Yes, it is; but we cannot reason on the basis of what may be. We must take the world as it is, and it certainly looks as if when land rises in value the pressure upon the urban population will become more severe than it is now.

STATESMAN.—You predict, then, social disturbances growing out of an increasing laboring population who are discontented because educated above their condition and who will revolt if subject to privation in a commercial crisis.

SIR O.—Yes; but are we not straying from the subject? We set out to foretell the probable changes likely to occur in the history and constitution of our country during the next century.

STATESMAN.—That inquiry suggests manifest destiny. Of course, before half a century is over we shall have acquired the Dominion of Canada, and shall have absorbed Mexico and Central America. The West India Islands will have become ours as well as the Sandwich Islands. By that time we will have a great foreign commerce of our own, and will necessarily have naval stations in distant seas.

SIR O.—That is a large programme, and if carried out will necessitate vital changes in the constitution and methods of our government. We can absorb the Dominion without doing us any harm; nay, with positive advantage, for the Canadians are of our own race and are trained in local self-government. This would settle the fishery business and all other disputes on a very satisfactory basis; but Mexico, Central America, the Sandwich Islands, and the West India Islands will involve governments which cannot be Democratic. We will never confer the right of suffrage upon the blacks, the mongrels

of Mexico or Central America, or the Hawaiians. They cannot govern themselves, and for us to do it would be against the genius of our Constitution in its present form; still I have no doubt we shall make the attempt.

STATESMAN.—Then may there not be some difficulty with our own black population? Is there not danger that the Gulf States may be given over wholly to the negroes? According to the census returns the increase of the whites from 1870 to 1880 was at the rate of 29.90, while the blacks increased at the rate of 34.67. At this rate the whites would in time be so outnumbered in the Southern States that they would not count as a political or industrial factor.

SIR O.—The census of 1880 showing the disproportionate large increase of the blacks was a surprise, for the whites had the advantage of increase by foreign immigration, and it was supposed that the freed slaves would show a heavy mortality, in view of their habits and indifference to the well-being of their offspring. The census of 1890 may tell a different story. I suppose we must be prepared for an increase in the black population that borders on the Gulf. The manufacturing interests of the new iron and coal regions of Virginia, Tennessee, and Alabama will necessarily bring in a large white population, which will drive the negroes southward into the more purely agricultural districts. I presume the race of mulattoes is dying out. Some few will intermingle with whites, but the bulk of them will become darker in hue as each generation passes by, for the irregular alliances between blacks and whites are not by any means as frequent under freedom as during slavery. Hence the dividing line between the two races will yearly become more marked. If the blacks left to themselves

become as degraded as in the West India Islands, the time may come when they will be treated as badly as the Chinese and Red Indians are now, even to the extent of depriving them of their political privileges. Practically this is the case to-day over a large section of the South. The white race is dominant and will keep their position, no matter how numerous the negroes may become.

STATESMAN.—Do you think then that the American people may forget the Declaration of Independence, and reverse the legislation favoring the colored people, which began with President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation?

SIR O.—I would hardly go as far as that. I do not expect to see slavery restored, but should not be surprised if in the next hundred years there was a national system of employing labor, under which every able-bodied man or woman would be set to work, if they could not get remunerative employment in any other way. In the coming scientific age there will be less sentimentalism than there is now. Men and women will not be allowed to drink themselves to death. The tramp will not be tolerated, and the idle and vicious will be put under the severest restraint. More attention will be given to our duties, and less will be said about our rights. I believe that the law will go so far as to prevent the criminal and diseased from marrying and having families. Children will not be born under conditions that will ensure them life-long misery—or make them a peril to the community.

STATESMAN.—All this is aside. What other influences do you see at work which may be important factors in determining the course of our history.

SIR O.—The drift of events is discouraging legislative governments. We are beginning to find that boards

of aldermen and State legislators tend to be corrupt, because it is impossible to fix responsibility on evil-doers. Hence we see that in our municipalities larger powers are lodged in our mayors and heads of departments, while the privileges of our aldermen are being gradually cut down. The amendments to the laws for the last ten years are all in the direction of giving almost unchecked power to the mayors of large cities. The experiment was first tried in Brooklyn, and worked so well that the charters of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and many minor cities have been altered so as to strengthen the power of the mayor and take away the authority of the local legislative boards. Home Rule has broken down in that respect in this country. In many State constitutions will be found provisions prohibiting counties and cities from creating permanent debts beyond a certain percentage of the taxable value of the realty affected. It was found that aldermen and supervisors all over the Union were utterly reckless in the expenditure of money. In time State legislators will have their wings clipped, for the reason that they do not give us wise and economical government. As to our national legislature, it will be observed that it is growing to be less and less a debating body. An orator of great power was once a force in the House of Representatives; but the individual member now counts for little unless he is chairman of an important committee. It is in these sub-congresses, as they may be called, that the real work is done. Every law that is proposed has to go to its appropriate committee. As a council of war never fights, so a house committee never sanctions legislation of a bold and striking character. Every bill reported is of a commonplace character, representing a compromise in which some routine

congressman has the most to say. The speeches in the lower House have so little significance at present, that the newspapers do not report them. It is only a few of the Senators that have the ear of the country.

STATESMAN.—Can you mention any other possible seed of internal trouble?

SIR O.—Yes; I may refer to one other. Exclusive lawyer rule will yet create violent disturbance. Our whole machinery of justice is out of gear, for it is becoming more costly and inefficient. As time rolls by, crime is not punished, justice is not done. The lawyer learns nothing, forgets nothing. All the inventions and business devices of the age tend to abridge space, limit time, and save money, but the legal machinery grows yearly more inefficient and wasteful of time and money. Vigilance committees will exist in every part of the country if this state of things continues.

STATESMAN.—I can understand why a close monopoly of government by one profession, should be abused. But is there not some balm in Gilead? In other words, does not the United States owe something to the legal profession? And may not the lawyers be useful in the working of our institutions in the years to come?

SIR O.—I have always thought it unfortunate that our rulers were so exclusively lawyers. Since the beginning of our government it is safe to say that we have had among our legislators and executives twice as many lawyers as representatives from all other classes besides. This is as true of our local as of our State and national legislative bodies. In other words, lawyers make our laws as legislators, expound them as judges, and execute them as mayors, governors, and presidents.

STATESMAN.—On the whole, I think that lawyer-rule in this country has not been an unmixed evil. In working our Republican institutions it required men trained in a profession, which called for adaptability. Soldiers and men of business are too often uncompromising. They go straight to the mark, even at the risk of disorder and violence. It has passed into an axiom in England, that politics should not be logical; and the lawyer reaches his results by the adaptation of means to ends, without reference to consistency. So far the legists have done well by the country. Take the case of the Electoral Commission which made Hayes President. It was a device to get over what seemed to be a situation which did not admit of compromise. Were it not that Tilden was a compromising and personally a rather timid lawyer, we might then have had civil war. The whole course of our history would have been changed had an ambitious self-willed man like Stephen Douglass, or a soldier like General Hancock been in Tilden's place.

SIR O.—It may be that the lawyer will do something to make up for the want of elasticity in our written Constitution. As you say, the legal mind is fertile in expedients and devices. When an emergency arises which calls for national action not warranted by the text of the Constitution, the lawyer-statesman will be ready with his new glosses and interpretations of words so as to meet the difficulty. Our civil conflict was fought outside of our Constitution under an undefinable war power. Our organic law says in so many words that silver and gold shall be our only currency; but the Supreme Court has decided that in peace as in war Congress can make paper money legal-tender. Hence in the absence of any constitutional amendments our courts will interpret the

words of our Constitution in a way to make it conform to the emergency and to a common-sense dealing with the situation as it arises. As in the great religions of the world, the original doctrines are negatived and antagonized by legend, tradition, glosses, and downright falsification; so it may be with our Constitution in the next century. That instrument, as interpreted by the courts, may be entirely different from what its original text would imply.

STATESMAN.—That will do for internal troubles. What fears have you from our external relations?

SIR O.—I think it is very likely that some nation with a large fleet will capture our principal seaport cities. There are six billions of property on our coasts absolutely unprotected. The fleets of England, France, or Germany could easily occupy New York and other cities, and could exact an indemnity of five hundred millions of dollars. Our own Admiral Porter voices the general verdict of our naval and military officers, as well as of intelligent civilians, when he says that we are utterly defenceless, and that it would take twenty years of lavish expenditure to make us safe from foreign attack. It will be remembered that in the war of 1812, before the era of steamships, a British fleet captured Washington and burnt our Capitol.

STATESMAN.—But what harm are we doing to foreign nations? What grievance have they against us? And if we avoid all cause of quarrel and keep to ourselves, why should we be attacked? This is an era of peace and industry.

SIR O.—Stuff and nonsense. There are more armed soldiers in the Christian nations of Europe to-day than was ever before known in the history of the world. We

are on the eve of one of the mightiest conflicts that history has ever recorded. China and Japan were both peace-loving nations, without armies or defences, willing to do any thing to avoid fighting, but the great powers of Europe compelled them to open communication for the sake of trade, and Protestant England and Catholic France sent their armies to Pekin to force the Chinese to buy their opium and goods. There is no instance in history of a nation that was rich and unprotected which was not plundered by some robber nation that was well armed.

STATESMAN.—What particular nation do you fear?

SIR O.—Germany. In the coming international war the Germans will want money. England may be her ally, as well as Italy. These powers could easily capture our sea-coast, and Great Britain, through its Welland Canal, could put a fleet of gun-boats on the lakes and destroy or lay under contribution Rochester, Buffalo, Toledo, Cleveland, Chicago, and Milwaukee. Our people know that we are, potentially, the most powerful military and naval nation on earth, but actually at present we are not in a position to defend ourselves against a feeble power. We have neither war-ships, guns, nor fortifications. The slugger Sullivan, if unarmed, would be at the mercy of a boy six years old equipped with a loaded revolver. That is our position to-day. The time is coming when we shall be terribly humiliated.

STATESMAN.—The prospect you give us is not very encouraging. I, for my part, am inclined to be more hopeful; but I see there is no use in arguing the matter. Cannot you point out some of the rosy aspects of our possible future?

SIR O.—That has been done so often and so effectual-

ly that I thought that I might be spared the task. I suppose, however, a few words may not come amiss. Our country is increasing in wealth and population. Its people will, I think, be as wise in the future as in the past. Education is being more widely diffused, and somehow I believe that while we shall have serious difficulties to meet we shall overcome them as speedily in the second century of our existence as we did in the first century. Before many years I think we shall annex the Dominion, and, somehow or other, we shall rehabilitate our merchant marine and our flag will again be seen on every sea. Neither have we much to fear from the extension of our territory. The tendencies of all modern nations is to larger aggregations of domain. Compare the Germany and Italy of 1888 with the Germany and Italy of twenty-five years ago, and you will see the truth of my statement. Notice also the fate of all attempts at the disintegration of peoples. Hungary could not detach itself from Austria, nor Ireland from Great Britain, nor the Southern States of this Union from the Northern. Steam and the telegraph have a constant tendency to bind people together. Mr. Bryce, whom I have quoted, makes this pregnant observation: "Nor does the growth of the Union make the retention of its parts more difficult. On the contrary, the United States is a smaller country now, when it stretches from the Bay of Fundy to the Gulf of California, with its 60,000,000 people, than it was with its 13,000,000, just as the civilized world was larger at the time of Herodotus than it is now, for it took twice as many months to travel from Persepolis or the Caspian Sea to the Pillars of Hercules as it does now to circumnavigate the globe; one was obliged to use more languages and the journey

was inconceivably more dangerous." But for all that can be said about our prosperity, I, for one, wish that we could commemorate the adoption of the first Constitution by holding a great national convention to revise it. It would be a splendid education for this generation if we were once more to discuss the conditions which lie at the basis of efficient government. At present our political discussions are petty and personal. Were it proposed to hold a national convention, they would gain immensely in dignity and weight.

OUR FUTURE FOREIGN POLICY.

PUBLICIST.—I see it is officially announced that our new navy will consist of thirty-one vessels. This includes cruisers, floating batteries, and despatch boats, all of which have been or will be constructed with a view to the exigencies of modern naval warfare. In a few years, therefore, we shall be able to assume a somewhat bolder front to secondary nations; but the inadequacy of our shore defences in the neighborhood of our great seaport cities will, for many years, force us to speak with bated breath to first-class naval powers like Great Britain, Germany, France, or Italy.

SIR ORACLE.—I have always been a persistent advocate of the creation of a navy suitable for defensive purposes. History is full of warnings as to the unwisdom of leaving rich cities or communities at the mercy of well-armed powers. The robber instinct is as strong to-day as ever among organized governments, as witness the attitude of the Western powers towards China, Japan, and indeed all semi-civilized and savage people, but I should deplore any disposition to build a navy that would be a menace to foreign powers. We Americans are a venturesome and vainglorious people; and if we had an effective naval force there would be a temptation to bluster on the part of our Presidents and Secretaries of State, more particularly when an election was pend-

ing. Note the attitude of the Senate and President Cleveland on the fisheries question. The treaty was rejected by the Senate to make party capital, and then came the President's retaliation message, which was pure buncombe. Had we an efficient navy when an ambitious Executive was seeking re-election, there would be real danger of unnecessary wars.

PUB.—Is it not inevitable that the United States will some day take its place among the nations as a great power in international questions? We still pursue the lines of foreign policy laid down by Washington. Yet how changed are the conditions! We live in a different era. Potentially, I think, we are the greatest power on earth—actually, one of the weakest. But will we consent to fill this humble *rôle* for many years longer?

SIR O.—I have always believed that some President or other would startle the nation and astonish foreign powers by having a say on some matter of international concern. We soon shall have 70,000,000 of inhabitants, who will be in intimate trade relations with other countries. We cannot avoid having business and other interests which would justify us in discussing such matters before the tribunal of great nations.

PUB.—What do you think will be the occasion of a probable new departure in our foreign policy?

SIR O.—My hope has been that our first attempt at becoming a great power among other great powers would be in the direction of international conventions unifying the coinage of the world, adopting some universal system of weights and measures, establishing a telegraphic code or maritime rules. I have thought the commercial nations ought to own the ocean cables jointly; for, clearly, they should not be in private hands, as they give us the

quotations of all the markets of the world. But there is one matter which is destined to excite a great deal of interest in the not distant future, and which may force us out of the isolation which has marked our foreign policy during our century of existence as a nation.

PUB.—And that is?

SIR O.—The opening of the Panama Canal. I assume that great work will be successfully accomplished, to the lasting credit of the French people and the enduring fame of Count Ferdinand de Lesseps. Now, for obvious national considerations, this very commendable enterprise has been looked on with jealous eyes by the American people. When it is completed, the trade between Western Europe and Eastern Asia will no longer pay tribute to the transportation system of the United States. Then it is not unlikely that foreign powers will combine to control the canal, so that trade would not be interrupted in case of war. This might infringe upon the American conception of the Monroe doctrine, and we might be forced to take a position antagonistic to the great powers of Europe. If by that time we have an effective navy and reasonably good defences for our seaport cities, we might run the risk of a war rather than permit the Panama Canal to remain in the control of powers which are our commercial rivals. We are not, however, in a position to take a bold stand, nor shall we be so for many long years, for although we have the nucleus of a navy, we have no guns or fortifications to insure safety to our great seaport cities.

PUB.—You forget the possibilities of torpedo systems. Then there is the new dynamite gun, which could shatter a mighty iron-clad to pieces, if the latter only got near enough.

SIR O.—Yes, if it only got near enough. But so far these dynamite charges reach only short distances, and though torpedoes have long been known in naval warfare I fail to recall a single instance in which they have done material damage. They may be more successful in the future, but the matter is too important to be left to a possibility such as that.

PUB.—You think, then, that when this Panama-Canal question comes up there is likely to be trouble with foreign powers. If next year should see a war in Europe, can we escape being mixed up with it in some way?

SIR O.—When the inevitable conflict begins on the Eastern question it is likely to create a conflagration of war that will involve all the leading nations of the earth. My impression is that the new Emperor William of Germany aspires to be a modern Alexander the Great. His appeals to the army, his attention to military details, the changes he is making in the *personnel* of the leaders of his troops, his sudden calling out of great bodies of soldiers to test their discipline and readiness, all seem to point to an intention on his part to lead his conquering Teutons either West or East. He may turn out to be a Frederick the Great, or he may reproduce the idiosyncrasies of that great monarch's father, who paid a great deal of attention to the discipline and efficiency of his army, but avoided war persistently.

PUB.—In the past, these military monarchs could do very much as they pleased, for the nations were composed mainly of nobles, priests, and peasants. The banking, manufacturing, and mercantile classes were but poorly represented, and had no *status* in the courts of the warrior kings; but the great bankers, merchants, manufacturers, and representatives of the middle class are now

very powerful. Their interests are best subserved by peace, not war. Will not they insist that no unnecessary international conflicts shall take place?

SIR O.—I confess I am curious to note the attitude of the commercial classes during the next great war in Europe. The Semitic element is very powerful in trading circles. It is not averse to war, for the daring mercantile genius of the Hebrew utilizes for his own purposes these international conflicts. He delights in great risks and has profited by all modern wars. Our civil conflict added very greatly to the wealth of the Jewish traders.

PUB.—Still I judge that the complex civilization of our modern era is the foe of the war spirit. The German people are so highly educated that I think they would become restive under a monarch who was disposed to enter into new conflicts merely to add to his personal renown. There is no place in our modern world for the Louis XIVs or the Napoleons of the past.

SIR O.—Yet there were never so many men under arms as to-day. The treasure spent on armaments is appalling, and it is a question whether the fight had not better begin, so that some one power could become dominant. Then we might hope to see a forced reduction of useless armaments.

PUB.—But to return to our own country. What effect would it have on our politics were the American people to be represented in the council of nations?

SIR O.—It would at once raise the whole tone of our political discussions. Our politics now are petty, provincial, and personal. Read the English press and note the parliamentary debates. Mark how imperial topics come to the fore. We cannot breed a race of great statesmen until we have our say in international matters. We shall

meet with some unpleasant surprises when we desire to take our place among the nations of the earth. We are not only without colonies and distant naval stations, but our coasts are surrounded with a cordon of fortifications in the hands of foreign powers. The possession of the Bermuda Islands by Great Britain, General McClellan said, was worth an army corps to the Southern Confederates. These islands were the head-quarters for the blockade runners. Havana and the island of Cuba profited greatly by the contraband trade during the civil war. When we wake to a consciousness of our own strength, we will insist on the possession of all the fortifications near our coasts. This will involve the annexation of many of the West India islands.

PUB.—You believe, I think, that the Dominion of Canada will some day become a part of the United States. Will this come about peaceably?

SIR O.—I fear not; there is every human reason why this dependency of Great Britain should become a part of our Union, but the unnatural barriers in the way will probably finally be broken down by force.

POSSIBILITIES IN THE WAY OF PARTY ORGANIZATIONS

VOTER.—What is there to be said respecting the historical parties of the country? Will the present divisions last for any length of time? Or will there be new combinations and more radical and far-reaching programmes?

SIR ORACLE.—Parties in all free governments should represent—the one, order; the other, progress. There should be a conservative organization, and one that aims at reform. Political parties represent, in other words, the centripetal and centrifugal forces in the political world. Hence you will find that parties are apt to separate on a theory as to the functions of government; the conservatives holding that the central authority should be strong and capable of doing many things for the benefit of the entire community. A democratic party, on the contrary, favors home rule, local independence, and individual initiative. The distinctions I have made will account for the Tory in England and the Federals and Whigs in the United States, both of which have generally been the parties of authority and order. The English Liberals and the American Democrats have aimed to satisfy the aspirations of the people for reform and improvement.

VOTER.—Your generalizations are interesting, but I

think not quite accurate. In the slavery controversy the Democratic party was the conservative one, and bent all its energies to keep the black men enslaved.

SIR O.—History is full of such inconsistencies. The old Democratic party was the foe of monopolies; but its States-right notions made it the defender of slavery as it existed under State laws. But the Democratic party did all it could to make every adult white male a voter, and it favored equal rights to all except the negro.

VOTER.—But in the new combinations of voters will there not be some changes? Will there not be other ideals than those of the past which the great political organizations of the future will strive to follow?

SIR O.—The Democratic party of the future will, I think, become in a measure socialistic. If it aims to placate the great wage-receiving class, it must consent to using the machinery of the government for the benefit of the mass of the community. This is the aim of the social democracy of Europe. Kings, nobles, and priests have heretofore made use of the powers of the State to further their interests, and the progressive reformers will insist that hereafter the authority of the general government shall be so wielded as to advance the welfare of the bulk of the people. Common schools, public roads, government telegraphs, State control of railroads, recreative parks, State and municipal sanitation,—all these show the spread of State socialism. Indeed, from one point of view tariff legislation is socialistic. It aims to create conditions favoring the establishment of industries beneficial to the community.

VOTER.—Will our national party organizations continue to live into the twentieth century? That is, shall we continue to hold voluntary national conventions to

nominate the party candidates and put together the party platforms?

SIR O.—Whatever changes will be effected in the direction of State socialism will not, I think, come through national party action. Our country is so large, and national party organizations will represent such widely diversified interests, that every new convention which sits will find it more and more difficult to agree to any affirmative propositions. Hence our national platforms are vaguer as time rolls by. The average politician wants to offend no one; and this is why negative Presidential candidates and "dark horses" take the place of really able statesmen in our quadrennial contests.

VOTER.—If we abolished the electoral college and voted directly for Presidential candidates, would it not give a chance to the great men of the respective parties to become Presidential candidates?

SIR O.—It is very certain that voting by States, as we do now, favors mediocrity at the expense of ability. Harrison was chosen because it was supposed he could carry Indiana; but were the votes of a party counted without respect to State lines, the most popular leader would be selected instead of a "dark horse."

VOTER.—Is not this likely to be done some day? Will people long continue to tolerate that obsolete institution, the electoral college?

SIR O.—Our Constitution is so difficult to change that I do not see any way to reform it. Our fundamental laws are like the decrees of the Medes and Persians—practically unalterable. This is one of the greatest perils of the country.

VOTER.—But if national conventions are going to be afraid of reforms, or the statement even of general pro-

positions, will they not fall into disrepute? The mere selection of a non-committal candidate will hardly fill the bill. The American people will get tired of its perfunctionary political machinery if its action becomes so commonplace.

SIR O.—Undoubtedly there are changes in our party machinery in store for us; but, so far, our great national organizations have had a conservative influence. They have sat upon all the cranky notions which come to the front so frequently. Voters do not like third or fourth parties. They do not care to support tickets which have no possible chance of an election.

VOTER.—Yet the anti-slavery party voted for candidates that had no hope of election, and the Prohibitionists are doing the same to-day. Had there been no anti-slavery organization there would have been no Republican party, and if the Prohibitionists are very strong in the coming election they may force the Republicans to adopt their cardinal principles in 1892.

SIR. O.—Perhaps. Still, despite the examples you have mentioned, it is difficult to organize a party which exists for the sake of standing up and being counted. The mass of average voters prefer to act with parties that either will win or come very near doing so. As I have said, when the country becomes larger and more populous, the more difficult will it be to effect radical reform. And the danger to our political institutions is stagnation rather than too great recklessness in reformatory legislation.

VOTER.—But what I want to get at is the probable changes in the machinery of our election systems. Will the political "boss" have so much to say in the future as in the past of our politics?

SIR O.—I should judge that as our country grows

larger the local, State, and national "boss" or leader would become more influential. It is an idle dream to suppose that the units which compose political organizations can act together without leadership. It is not "bosses" which are objectionable. We cannot get along without them. The only choice we have is between wise "bosses" and bad ones. What we require in war, industry, and politics are leaders who can lead and followers who can follow. Now, I do not know or care whether our convention system—local or national—will last through the twentieth century, but I am as certain as I live that if we expect to escape chaos we must follow recognized leaders. So far, the very life of our political parties depended upon men like the late Thurlow Weed and Dean Richmond, who, not holding office themselves, dictated the course and the candidates of their parties. Such leaders are inevitable; but they should never be candidates for office themselves.

RELIGIOUS CHANGES OF THE FUTURE.

CHURCHMAN.—What is there to be said touching the tendencies of religious thought? I assume that man is a religious animal; and that he will always worship something, as well as hold to a body of opinions which may be called his creed. But what direction is the drift of religious discussion taking?

SIR ORACLE.—Judged by their ability, and the influences they are exerting in the world of thought, it looks as though the philosophers who did not believe in any religious creed were pretty sure to be the most heard from in the future. But I, for my part, agree with you that man is naturally religious, and that if he gets rid of one faith, it is only to take up another.

CHURCHMAN.—I noticed from some statistics recently published about the religious sects of New York City, that since 1872 the population has increased at the rate of fifeeen per cent. per annum, while the church members in the meantime increased at the rate of only thirteen per cent. per annum. Then the Episcopalian body had added to its numbers more than any three of the other Protestant sects.

SIR O.—In a number of the *North American Review*, published in 1876, there was an article summarizing the history of the various sects during the previous century, which seemed to me very significant. At the close of

the revolutionary war, the Congregationalists were the dominant Christian sect. The form of their church government was democratic; their creed was of the sternest school of Calvinism. The Catholic Church then had few adherents; and the Episcopalians were under a cloud, because before and during the war it was the church of the Tories. Neither the Methodists nor the Baptists were then of much account numerically or otherwise. The changes in the religious thought of the nation in the hundred years were very notable. The Congregationalists, instead of being the first in numbers, were the seventh. Calvinism, once the dominant creed, is now discredited even by the Congregationalists themselves. The ritualistic sects, such as the Roman Catholics and the Episcopalians, have thriven and are thriving wonderfully. So also have the emotional sects, such as the Methodists and Baptists. Liberal Christianity, so called, unknown a century ago, has powerfully affected the religious thought of our time. Hence the change has been from stern dogma to a certain laxity in creed. Ritualism and emotionalism have grown at the expense of doctrine; while a hierarchy and a federative system, such as the Presbyterian synods, have taken the place of the republican home-rule church governments, which obtained at the beginning of our nation's history.

CHURCHMAN.—That is a very interesting summary of the drift of religious opinion in the past. Now what of the future? Is religion to be discredited by the speculative scientists and philosophers of the day, or is there to be a renaissance of faith?

SIR O.—I fear that well-informed men everywhere are now unbelievers in the creeds of Christendom. People now affect the emotional sects or the Episcopalians, be-

cause they are not asked to subscribe to the dogmas which were firmly believed one hundred years ago. Churches are now social centres quite as much as places of worship. People go to church to hear the music, to take part in the liturgy, or to listen to an eloquent discourse. A minister who dwelt continually on the old doctrines, especially that of hell-fire, would soon be preaching to empty benches.

CHURCHMAN.—So you think the generations to come will be what we call infidels?

SIR O.—Oh, no! Active unbelief is never long-lived. Man must have a theory of the universe, which is in itself a creed; he must also have some ethical standards. The trouble with the Christian creed is, that it is an antiquated one. It was formulated when men were ignorant of the facts of nature. There is no reconciliation possible between it and the latest results of modern thought and science. Nevertheless, man is a religious and a believing animal. He will, as I have said, have his theory of the universe and his system of morals. It is for the future to determine what these will be. In the meantime, I think that men will satisfy their emotional cravings by art—that is by music, eloquence, and church ritual. The sense of mystery will be appealed to more than it has been.

CHURCHMAN.—What are the striking features in the present religious movements of the world?

SIR O.—Mohammedanism is making wonderful progress in Africa, and is doing excellent work. Every Mussulman mosque and village not only establishes a fervent faith, but checks debauchery, and puts a stop to the ravages of the liquor traffic. Christian missionaries have, relatively, little success. The faith they teach is

too metaphysical for savage or semi-civilized people. Then the Christian missionary is generally accompanied by the dealer in fire-arms and bad spirits. The torrents of liquor poured into Africa by Germany and Great Britain is a scandal to all Christendom. It seems that in British India the Mohammedans make twenty converts where the Christians make one. I judge, however, that the spread of modern knowledge is discrediting all the creeds that have come down to us from the past. I do not pretend to be able to give even the vaguest guess as to the religious faith of the future. I see, however, very clearly that what we vaguely call Liberalism is undermining the old established creeds of the civilized world.

CHURCHMAN.—What will be the effect on the morals of mankind of this dying out of the old faiths?

SIR O.—I confess to feeling gloomy at times in view of the lessons taught by history. It will be noticed that the decay of civilization in the empires of the past began soon after the religious faith, which was the heart of the civilization, had died out. When the Grecian no longer believed in Zeus, Apollo, Aphrodite, and the Delphic oracles, the spread of civilization in that peninsula was at an end. When the Roman augurs laughed in each other's faces, Roman civilization was doomed. Can it be, I often ask myself, that we are again to be plunged into what may be called a "dark age," because the Christian faith is discredited throughout the thinking world? Must our civilization become eclipsed, as that of the Assyrians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans was?

CHURCHMAN.—The analogy between the past and our era seems to me overdrawn. But to our question. Surely you have some theory as to the course of religious thought, say for the next quarter of a century. If it is too

much to ask you to outline the faith of the future, you can at least try to tell us what will be the drift of religious opinions.

SIR O.—It is very clear, I think, that the lines of demarcation among the various Christian sects are being broken down. The philosophers of the day have been discrediting the fundamental doctrines of orthodox Christianity. Doubts are expressed as to the existence of God and the possibility of a future state. In presence of this dangerous enemy the various Christian sects have been forced to unite. Then, I think, in all countries there is a tendency towards a blending of diverse creeds. There were, for instance, in China three distinct religions. First there was Confucianism, which was a secular creed; then there was Tao-ism, a highly spiritualistic faith; and finally Buddhism. The boundaries between each were at one time very definitely drawn; but the Chinaman of to-day has a composite religion, made up of the three types mentioned above. We have seen in this country how Unitarianism has modified Presbyterianism, and how the Universalists, without increasing their own numbers, have succeeded in moderating the emphasis put upon hell-fire by the more orthodox sects. In the churches of the twentieth century fewer sects will be represented; creeds will be discredited; and art will be appealed to as an object of devotional feeling. I look for fewer sects, more union among Christians, and a gradual dying out of dogma. If we are to have a new modern creed, it will be in unison with the latest results of scientific thought and investigation.

THE RELATION OF THE SEXES.

SOCIAL REFORMER.—Since man emerged from the savage state he has been testing all possible forms of the sexual relation. There is not, I believe, in any language an exhaustive history of marriage,—under that term including every possible variation in the intimate relations of men and women; but we all know, in a general way, the leading types of marriage. The primitive man was the original free-lover. He did as the animals around him did—that is, he fought for the possession of the female; and in regions where food was easily procured he took no care of his own offspring. Then came polyandry, in which one woman was the wife of two or more men. This form of marriage probably had its origin in regions where the struggle for life was most difficult. In the "survival of the fittest" it was the warlike male rather than the timid female who was best able to overcome the unfavorable environment; hence too arose the practice of female infanticide, which survives to our own day in many parts of Eastern Asia. Monogamy is the type of marriage which made its appearance in the more advanced nations; but it was preceded by polygamy, in which more than one woman was the wife or concubine of one man. This last has been the favorite type of marriage the world over. It has prevailed in all climates among every known race of human beings; and

undoubtedly there must be some physiological reasons which account for the popularity of polygamy among the races of the earth. Our present inquiry is, What type of marriage is most likely to survive among the advanced nations of the world?

SIR ORACLE.—The question is a delicate one, and its discussion is likely to engender fierce animosities. The future type of marriage is a real enigma. I doubt, myself, if monogamy is the last word on that vital matter. You say that polygamy has probably a physiological foundation, by which you mean, of course, that it is more in accordance with the nature of things that one man should have several wives, rather than that one woman should have several husbands, or that one woman should be confined to one man. It is urged by the Mormons, as well as by other polygamous peoples, that the child-bearing woman should be relieved from the attentions of her husband from the beginning of gestation to the end of lactation,—a period covering nearly two years. But this continence would be unnatural to the male. His passions call for gratification, as a rule, at least monthly; hence polygamy, or that other institution, —deemed so immoral,—prostitution, which, I take it, is simply polyandry adapted to conditions existing in all monogamic communities.

S. R.—Our inquiry, as I understand it, is not what the true type of marriage should be, but what is the drift of things sexual? What changes are likely to take place in that institution by the close of the next century?

SIR O.—It would not be wise to pronounce definitely as to what the true relations of the sexes should be. That is a matter for science finally to determine. Man

has been accumulating experiences through all history bearing on that vital matter. We know, in a general way, that polyandry was an improvement on promiscuity, that polygamy was a great advance over polyandry, and that monogamy has been the type of marriage which has accompanied the highest civilization so far as known. It was undoubtedly one of the secrets of the success of ancient Rome. It gave birth to the family virtues, which made the Romans superior to other peoples in their epoch.

S. R.—If that is true, the question would seem to be settled as to the future of marriage. Monogamy must in time be the prevailing type throughout the world.

SIR O.—Not so fast, please. I did not say but what some variation of monogamy might not be the final result of historic tendencies and scientific conclusions. We know, in a general way, that the monogamic marriage tie is tending to become looser throughout Christendom. Marriage was once regarded as a sacrament, which could be dissolved only by the adultery of the wife; but it is curious to notice that religious revolts have generally been accompanied by a weakening of the religious and social sanctions to marriage. Martin Luther himself married a nun; and condoned, if he did not sanction, practical polygamy among the German princes. The Anabaptist fanaticism was characterized by wild sexual excesses. The immediate cause of the establishment of the Church of England was the desire of Henry VIII. to divorce one woman and marry another. But, of course, there were other factors in bringing about the English Reformation. All our loose divorce laws date from the Protestant revolt against Rome. Marriage is no longer a religious rite even in Catholic countries, but a

civil contract, and the logical result would seem to be a state of public opinion which would justify a change of partners whenever the contracting couple mutually agreed to separate.

S. R.—Surely that is not a desirable outlook. What becomes of the family? and how are children to be maintained if we return to what would, in reality, be promiscuity?

SIR O.—I am not describing what ought to be, but am trying to point out that, as a matter of fact, modern Christendom, monogamic though it calls itself, really recognizes all pre-existing forms of the relation of the sexes. The more moral part of the community, of course, accept the conventional monogamic marriage. Happily, so far, this type of the sexual relation is loyally recognized by the great bulk of civilized peoples. But we have promiscuity, polyandry, and polygamy right here in New York. Those who practise these, to us, objectionable forms of the sexual relation, are under a social ban; but the *demi-monde* is, after all, a real world, in which hundreds of thousands of civilized men and women live in all the great capitals of Christendom. I will not vouch for the exact figures; but it is alleged that in all monogamic communities one woman in every sixty, lives openly or secretly, an irregular sexual life. The cause of this may be poverty, or it may be passion; but we know that with certain females, as with many males, there is an instinct for change of partners which will be gratified. Happily these types of women are not common, but they exist nevertheless, as the many forms of the "social evil" attest. You know some of the French social theorists call this the *papillon* (butterfly) variety of women.

S. R.—Let us stick to our text. What changes do you look forward to in the prevailing type of marriage?

SIR O.—I confess to being gravely disquieted at the outlook. The drift of things since the Protestant Reformation has certainly been towards a loosening of social ties. In moral New England, one in every twelve marriages is openly dissolved. There must of course be a large percentage of cases in which husbands and wives are not faithful to one another, but who live together for the sake of their children, or in deference to social conventions. The wife being dependent is forced to condone irregularities on the part of her husband. If unfaithfulness was promptly followed by divorce, what an appalling state of things would be disclosed! I confess my gorge rises when I read the platforms of the party organizations respecting polygamy in Utah. Then look at that monstrous Edmunds Bill, confiscating the Mormon Church property. Polygamy as practised in Utah is a marriage institution sanctioned in nearly all ages and countries. What business have we to set up a social standard for others in the relation of the sexes when our own is practically so low?

S. R.—But are there no agencies at work to maintain the sanctity of the marriage relation and keep up our family life?

SIR O.—It seems to me that our modern methods of living rather tend to break up the family. Women are largely beginning to support themselves; they are being educated with that view. Those who enter a lucrative calling do not care to be the wives of men who cannot keep up the standard of comfort they have set for themselves. Hence there are great classes of women beginning to take part in our modern life who are not

dependent on the other sex, but who yet have the passions and affections common to the race. Our new modes of living are not such as conduce to the integrity of family life. The poor man and woman in the tenement house, and the rich man and wife in the great flat, are thrown into relations with other men and women of their several classes, which encourages intimacies not possible in the old isolated home. Look at the hotel life, which is so marked a feature of our modern way of living. Then this is a travelling age; men and women are changing, season by season, their local habitations. The public opinion of their environment is not the same as when surrounded by their family and friends. Both husbands and wives are separated oftener and for longer intervals than was the case before this age of swift and cheap steam travel. They carry their passions with them wherever they go, and are under less restraint than when their home life was more permanent.

S. R.—From what you say it would appear as if sexual chaos was just ahead of us.

SIR O.—After all, I judge that the majority of men and women will continue to be faithful wives and husbands; but I fear public opinion will hereafter tend to tolerate irregular types of the sexual relation. Time was when a divorced man or woman was looked upon with disfavor, and they were discountenanced by respectable people. This is so no longer. I think there is a disposition not to inquire too curiously into the private lives of the men and women we meet every day. If they respect the ordinary conventions, not much more is asked of them. Some day science will take up this question of the relation of the sexes. What its final verdict will be, no one can now foresee. I am, however, myself satisfied

that the science-crowned type of marriage will be monogamic. It will be the devotion of one man to one woman ; and it will be a permanent institution. A man and woman live together ; a child is born which requires the care of both father and mother until it reaches womanhood or manhood. In the meantime other children are born, who must also be cared for by both parents. Clearly under this natural order of things there is no chance for divorces or marital unfaithfulness without the direst consequences to the family. Monogamy, therefore, has a basis in the nature of things; but the question is whether that institution satisfies all the complex relations of humanity. In other words, will not both polyandry and polygamy be tolerated in the future history of the race? The verdict must be given by science, and affirmed or denied by our posterity.

IMPROVING THE RACE.

SOCIAL REFORMER.—Marriage has results other than those affecting the man and woman who enter into the conjugal relation. It usually involves offspring. Indeed, apart from the satisfaction to the individual, the aim of marriage is the perpetuation of the race. Now it is patent that in all the marriages of the past there has been no conscious effort on the part of men and women to improve the human race physically, mentally, or morally. A woman is sought for in marriage because she strikes the fancy of some man. He never inquires into her pedigree, nor does he concern himself what kind of children she may bear. A woman in accepting a suitor does so because he is agreeable to her and can support her comfortably. It never occurs to her to inquire if there was insanity or disease among her proposed husband's ancestors. Now in the loosening of the marriage tie, which you think is in store for us in the future, what are we to expect in the way of offspring? Will any effort be made to improve the breed of human beings? How will the mental and physical health of the future man compare with the man of to-day?

SIR ORACLE.—It would take volumes to properly answer your queries. I can give you only a few desultory guesses; and in discussing this matter I am very likely to tell you what ought to be rather than what will be.

We all have our theories as to what society should do; but then, somehow, the mass of mankind follow their instincts or the tendency of things without reference to moral considerations. My hope is that what we call science—that is, the organized common-sense or experience of mankind—will eventually be brought to bear upon the problem of the continuation of man's life on this planet. Science has been dealing with the inorganic world, and with the most surprisingly valuable results, as witness astronomy, physics, chemistry, and mechanical invention, such as steam, electricity, and the telephone. But of late years the scientific method has been applied to the organic world—that is, to biology, including under that term the phenomena connected with the life of man, individual and social. Science has not travelled far in this direction, but surprising as have been its discoveries in the inorganic world, they will be as nothing compared to what we may expect when man and society will be acted upon and modified by the social scientists of the future.

S. R.—All that is rather vague. Our present problem is, What is likely to occur in the next century?

SIR O.—I am afraid that little or nothing will be done in the way of stirpiculture—that is, the improvement of the race as a race. Man, by his forethought and care, has made marvellous improvements in the flora and fauna under his control. Take the case of the domestic animals. Compare the great variety of useful and beautiful dogs with their wolfish progenitors. See what man has done with horses, sheep, and other cattle which minister to his wants. Every one realizes that the same methods applied to the human race would give the best possible results; but as yet no one even dares to discuss this

delicate and vital matter. It does seem to me, however, that the time has come when society for its own protection should forbid conjugal unions that are likely to result in criminal, insane, or diseased offspring. This would make the physician instead of the clergyman the proper official to sanction a marriage. What a mockery it is when the priest asks the blessing of God upon a union that is certain to result in adding people to the world whose life is a misery to themselves and to others. We are only beginning to study heredity. It is a vast and fruitful field, and offers an opening for specialists, who may do much to help improve the man and woman of the future.

S. R.—But is it not true that without any special efforts there is a tendency in the race to improve itself. Sexual selection involves choice. The desirable man has his pick among the girls of his acquaintance. He naturally chooses the prettiest and the most vivacious. Good looks and high spirits are rarely the accompaniments of an organism predisposed to disease. It has been noted that the modern man and woman show an improvement over their forefathers, because they are better fed ; and their hours of toil have been reduced. Then is it not true that the length of human life has been increased within the last century, due to better physical conditions, and the removal of causes which shorten life ? The war on the diseases that come from impure air and foul water is ridding the world of the plagues and fevers which formerly decimated mankind.

SIR O.—There is, however, another side to that question. Human beings are now kept alive, who formerly perished because of their weakness and liability to fatal

diseases. I fear we have added to the length of life, while really lowering the average vitality. That is to say, feeble organisms, which would have perished under the old order of things, are kept alive, and continue their kind. Indeed I have often suspected that the overrunning of the ancient Roman world by the barbarians was largely due to the superior vitality and virility of the latter. In the struggle for life, only the strong survived; whereas, in the civilized communities of the ancient world, luxury undermined the strength of the mass of the community; and the more civilized conditions kept alive the weaklings, who had not the strength to contend successfully against the vigorous barbarians.

S. R.—Our conversation is getting rather discursive. Let us stick to our text. What has the future in store for us in the way of offspring? Will they be better or worse than those of the present generation?

SIR O.—If there is any value in my forecast that practically there will be several types of marriage recognized by the civilized world of the future, it follows, I fear, that the superior classes will have fewer children than they have now. As a general thing people who are cultivated and wealthy have small families. In the world of man as in the world of nature, it is the inferior types which propagate most freely. "Ill weeds thrive apace," says the proverb. It requires care to bring into being a beautiful and fragrant flower; but the utmost vigilance cannot prevent the propagation of the thistle and other weeds. People who have been bred in colleges, and live in costly houses have very few children; but see how the latter swarm around the tenement house, where the conditions of life are so unfavorable. How to civilize and humanize this mass of children born under the

most unfavorable conditions, is the great problem for the sociologists.

S. R.—There is an offset to this undue multiplication of undesirable offspring. The well-born child lives and thrives, while the human weeds are cut down. Note the terrible mortality of children born in tenement houses. Great cities consume human life ; that is, there are more die than are born there. Those who survive are the well-born, or the comers from the country.

Sir O.—There is one feature in the life of Continental Europe which is improving the race in a way little suspected. The universal military conscription is adding wonderfully to the vitality of the races subject to it. About all of the young men of the Continent have to serve from three to five years in the army. They are wholesomely fed, kept much in the open air, are forced to take gymnastic exercises, and to submit to a drill and discipline, all of which adds to their bodily vigor. The people of the British Islands have no such training ; and that is why, in the next great war, the British troops will be at a disadvantage in fighting either the French or the Germans. If the young women of the Continent had the same physical advantages as the young men, I would expect to see a marvellous improvement in the physique of the next generation. One reason for the defeat of the French in the last war with Germany was the former's inferior bodily vigor. Napoleon's wars were destructive of human life. The young and virile men were killed and disabled, and the work of continuing the French race was left to the old, or those too feeble for military service. It has been said that the stature of the Frenchmen decreased two inches, because of the Napoleonic wars. I judge the conscription to which the French have had

to resort will add to the bodily vigor of the race, and tend to enable them to do better in their next conflict with the Germans. We Americans live under favorable conditions for generating a strong race of men and women. We are well fed; out-door and athletic exercises are encouraged; and we take more holidays than did our fathers. The hours of labor have also been cut down by law and custom. There are some splendid types of men in certain sections of our country, where there is plenty of lime in the soil, as in the blue grass region south of the Ohio. Our variable climate is somewhat against us; so is the growth of our factory system.

S. R.—Is it not unfortunate that our immigrants all belong to the lower classes? Look at the Germans, the Irish, and worst of all the small and swarthy Italians, who are making their homes with us. How much better it would be if the immigrants were from the upper cultivated class of Europeans.

Sir O.—There is, I think, another side to that question. Evolution is generally from lower to higher forms of life. Your cultivated European may have reached a stage in which there is no further progress. All the possibilities of the future are with the more backward classes. This is why the Russians are coming to the front, because their civilization is undeveloped; and I think those so-called poorer people of the Old World have more stamina in them than the classes whose culture may have robbed them of their vitality.

S. R.—Still you do not meet the question. Will the type of American, for instance, advance or retrograde by the next generation?

Sir O.—Candidly there are so many considerations in the problem you present that I must refuse to commit my-

self. I do not think there will be any marked improvement in the race until scientists take the matter of its continuance into their hands. They must lay down the law that should govern the relation of the sexes, and men and women must conform to it. There is such a world of prejudice to overcome; and changes in social relations must be so radical that it will be many generations before the conditions will be such that we may expect any decided improvement.

THE SECRET OF THE JEWISH RACE.

ETHNOLOGIST.—I have a theory to suggest with regard to the Jews, which may account for some of the peculiarities of that remarkable race. If there is any truth in the Old-Testament legends, the progenitors of the Hebrews were Abraham and Sarah his half-sister. The marriage of blood relatives at that age of the world was not only permissible, but even was regarded as desirable. There was a time when the Egyptian ruling families were of pure breed. As that term was then understood, it meant the offspring of brothers and sisters. I believe inbreeding of this kind was not unknown in Babylon, Nineveh, and other ancient empires.

SIR ORACLE.—The general impression nowadays is that these incestuous marriages would have very bad results in the way of offspring. Inbreeding is said to produce insanity, disease, and marked physical degeneration.

ETHNOLOGIST.—Yet we know this is not the case in animals domesticated by man. True you can produce weakness by breeding "too fine," as it is termed, and a wise crossing of horses and cattle is not only permissible, but desirable. Yet the fact remains that to establish a breed, and to insure excellence in certain directions, there must be a good deal of inbreeding. Further, it may be well to particularize about that "Old-Testament legend" to which I have just referred. Abra-

ham married his half-sister, his brother Nahor his niece, the daughter of still another brother; and Jacob married at the same time two sisters who were his cousins. Esau's wife was his cousin; Amram's, his aunt; and Judah's, his daughter-in-law, the widow of his own son. Whether all this can be literally true or not, the fact remains clear that in those days the marriage of near relations was considered more desirable than objectionable.

SIR O.—But surely there is some reason for the prevailing prejudice against such marriages. Do they not, as a matter of fact, often result in diseased offspring.

ETHNOLOGIST.—The only scientific inquiry into the subject I know of is that conducted by Mr. George H. Darwin, the son of Charles Darwin, and himself no mean biologist. After a careful investigation of the facts, Mr. Darwin has come to the conclusion that, as regards the tendency of the marriage of first cousins to produce insane offspring, the percentage of such children resulting from such marriages is not so much greater than that in the general population as to enable one to say positively that the marriage of first cousins has any effect on the production of insanity and idiocy. Yet, while he comes to the general conclusion that the evil has been very much exaggerated, he nevertheless thinks that there is some slight ground for it. There can be no doubt, he says, about the danger of a nearly related man and woman, both of whom have inherited a decided tendency to some serious constitutional disease or weakness. Personally I would go farther than this. The law in the case is, I think, that the most pronounced traits in the allied blood is intensified in their offspring. Hence, if there is a tendency to insanity in cousins, their offspring will be insane. Scrofulous or consumptive cous-

ins will also bring undesirable children into the world; but I think the records show that where the cousins are wholesome of body and mentally bright, their children will be the same. Then, again, if the parents of allied bloods have marked defects of character, of body, their children will show in an intensified degree the weakness of their progenitors. Now take the case of the Jews. They are a very remarkable race, and have wonderful vitality. Their rare abilities and equally striking defects are as apparent to-day as they were two thousand years ago.

SIR O.—An inquiry into the secret of the strength of this remarkable race is timely. Because of their business abilities, they are getting more than their share of wealth in every community in which they live. The Jew has seen the rise and fall of the Grecian as well as of the Roman race; but his vitality has outlasted that of all contemporary and succeeding peoples. He is abreast not only with the civilization, but of the foremost men of the present dominant races of the world.

ETHNOLOGIST.—All that is true enough; but the question for you to answer is: What will be the probable future of the Jews? Will they retain their peculiarities as a distinct people, or will they be absorbed eventually into the surrounding populations?

SIR O.—The preservation of the Hebrew race under so many different conditions of life is one of the marvels of history. They have been scattered over the earth; have lived in all climates; and have been subject to all kinds of government; yet their racial peculiarities remain the same as they were while in bondage in Egypt. I, for one, am inclined to believe that the Jew is getting ready to be absorbed into communities where he is treated as an equal.

George Barrow long ago pointed out the fact that the Zingali or Gypsies did not lose their racial peculiarities until they were made equal with other men before the law. They ceased to become a distinct people from that time forth. Now this seems to me is what is happening to the Jews. In the United States the great bulk of them have become what is called "reform" Jews. They make use of modern music in their worship, the sexes sit together in the synagogue, the rabbi is a preacher and minister rather than a priest; and their authorized creed differs but little from that of the New England Unitarian. In all the large cities of the Union there are numerous bodies of Jews who are Agnostics; who do not believe in Moses and the prophets, or even Jehovah and the life hereafter. Then there is a disposition to get rid of the distinctive Hebrew names. There are thousands of Jewish children with Christian surnames; and their number is growing. The great Rothschild family have set the example of amalgamation by marrying Christians of rank. The case of the Jews illustrates the old fable of the contest between the wind and the sun to induce the traveller to lay aside his cloak. The fiercer the wind blew, the more tightly did the traveller clasp his outer garment about him; but the melting rays of the sun forced him to cast it aside. So long as the Jew was persecuted he clung to his religion and his traditions; but where he is equal before the law, he aspires also to reach social equality and puts aside his racial isolation. If we would make the Jew a part of our civilization, we must treat him as we would any other citizen.

ETHNOLOGIST.—Apart from what you say, I judge that there must be some defects in the Jewish character to account for the way they have been treated for the last

1800 years. It is to be noted that in every climate, under every religion, at every stage of civilization except the last, they have excited passionate hatred, and hence have been universally persecuted. Now the Hebrews cannot have been always right, and the people with whom they lived always wrong. There must be an underlying cause for hatred as well as for love. In truth, the Jew, while he has brilliant and admirable qualities, is treacherous, over-reaching, rapacious, and cruel. The race has amazing ability; of that there can be no doubt, especially of the commercial kind; but they do not play fair in the game of fortune. Lacking true pride of character, they are vain, ostentatious, and insolent. The anti-Semitic agitation in Germany is due doubtless, in great part, to envy at their vast accumulations of wealth in recent years; but it is in part justified by the ostentation and rapacity of the great body of the Jews.

SIR O.—There is no doubt about it. As I have already said, the Jews of modern Christendom are forging ahead of all their rivals. They are getting vastly more than their share of the wealth of the community; and what is still more significant they are willing to give their children the advantage of the best education. Our universities and colleges, male and female, contain a great many Jews and Jewesses. It is desirable for the Jews themselves that they should blend with the populations about them; for if they should continue to be a distinct class their vast accumulations of wealth will in time excite the jealous fury of all the rest of our people.

ETHNOLOGIST.—I think there is this moral to be drawn from the history of the Jews. We should pay more attention to heredity; and experiments should be made to found families having distinctive and admirable

characteristics. We have had some remarkable families in this country, as witness the Beechers. The offspring of old Lyman Beecher from his two wives were all of them distinguished as either speakers or writers. Yet so far as we know, the second or third generation of the family are only average people. Recalling Abraham and Sarah, one cannot but think of Mrs. Beecher Stowe's horror of the supposed relations between Lord Byron and his half-sister Mrs. Leigh. It is hard to avoid speculating on what might have happened had the public opinion of our time condoned a union between that family of half-brothers and half-sisters. Then there is the Adams family—a race of statesmen for three generations without the aid of the intermarriage of allied bloods. Then again the Harrison family, which have produced men of considerable note from the time of Cromwell to our own day. Further there is the Leland family, whose specialty seems to be hotel-keeping; and the Washburn family, four brothers of whom were intelligent and successful politicians. Doubtless there are hundreds if not thousands of other families, the members of which had marked special abilities; but we have no machinery for conserving and perpetuating breeds of special excellence.

SIR O.—With our present marriage customs I do not see how it is possible even to discuss the means to be used for generating certain breeds of human beings The Oneida Communists made an experiment in stirpiculture. Seventy children were born under a system which eliminated undesirable parents and confined parentage to the most desirable males and females in the Community family. The result was in every way remarkable. Though much of the original stock was poor enough, only two of the seventy children born died be-

fore the age of five. In the tenement-house district of our large cities, half the children die before that age. But the Christian people of Oneida County were horrified at this attempt to improve the race without reference to the ordinary marriage conventions; and they forced the Communists to become monogamists. Polygamy is practised all over the earth. It is indeed the most popular form of marriage, though it does not produce such good results as monogamy. But the attempt of the Mormons to practise this ancient and honored form of marriage is antagonized by the whole United States; and our Congress, in obedience to the outraged and ignorant sensibilities of the community, has passed laws to put a stop to it, and to rob that sect of their property. I doubt, if in any part of the world, for the next century, there will be found any community willing to make experiments in improving the human race, as the domestic animals have been improved.

A DISCURSIVE CHAPTER.

UTOPIAN.—Why not devote a chapter to possible Utopias? I know that your wish to follow out the line of existing tendencies without reference to your own ideas as to how the tangled scheme of human affairs should be arranged; but suppose we dwell upon some of the ideal states towards which so many think the race is tending. Now war is irrational and in every way objectionable. Is there not growing up a sentiment against it? Is it so wild a dream to expect that in the next century great international courts will settle disputes between nations?

SIR ORACLE.—I do not take any stock in the plan of settling disputes between nations by arbitration or international courts. No court can speak with authority unless it has at its command the physical power of a nation or nations. In other words, the club of the policeman and the bayonet of the soldier must carry out the *fiat* of a court of last resort. We cannot have peace in Europe until there is one nation so powerful that the others will be forced to obey its behests. For thirty years past I have believed that Russia would be the predominant power on the continent of Europe. If it did not actually conquer the Teutonic and Latin races, its military superiority would be so great that the latter would be forced to acknowledge its supremacy. Then, but not until

then, will it be feasible to reduce armaments and military expenses.

UTOPIAN.—Our readers will think that forecast as wild as my dream of universal peace through the establishment of courts of international arbitration. You speak of the future preponderance of Russia in Europe. Will it not be still more the master of Asia?

SIR O.—The Muscovite is performing a wonderful work in Central Asia; and, from a superficial point of view, it would seem as if it must come into the possession of both India and China. A great source of strength to the Russian power is its ability to absorb and assimilate the races it conquers. The scattered tribes which have heretofore occupied all Central Asia will, in the next generation, be as good Russians as are the people of Moscow or those who live in and near St. Petersburg. The blending of races, which has been going on in Russia for three hundred years or longer, is something quite remarkable. The English race in all parts of the world exterminates the savages or semi-civilized peoples with whom it comes in contact, as witness the fate of the Red Indian, and the aborigines of Australia and New Zealand,—in short all races save alone the Hindoos, which were too numerous to be exterminated. The Latin races have blended with the inferior peoples which they dominated, but the mixtures have generally been unfortunate. Hence the inferiority of the people of Mexico, Central and South America to those of North America and Australia.

UTOPIAN.—This seems to me a digression. Why do you speak so confidently of Russia practically overrunning the rest of Europe and yet hesitate in predicting its mastery of Asia? Surely the Teutons, the Latins, and

the Anglo-Saxons are more likely to be able to resist the conquering march of the Russians than the people of Hindoostan or China.

SIR O.—I presume it is written in the Book of Destiny that Russia, within the next fifty years, will get possession of Turkey, Persia, and Hindoostan; but in China there are four hundred millions of people. They do not fear death; they are amenable to discipline; and, properly armed and led, I don't see why they might not be a match even for the Russian power. Auguste Comte says somewhere that, if the Chinese could believe in God, they would conquer the world. I confess to being somewhat puzzled as to the connection between a theistic faith and military ambition, but, curiously enough, recent writers—John Russel Young, late Minister to China, among others—have given it as their opinion that China possesses all the elements of a first-class military power. They are becoming armed very rapidly as the aggressiveness of Western Europe is forcing them to learn the arts of war. Just think of the mighty armies that China could send out if she was intent on overcoming her enemies! The latter would be literally overwhelmed by numbers.

UTOPIAN.—In view of the wretched figure that China cut as a military power when attacked by the French and English fleets and armies this notion of yours will be laughed at as absurd.

SIR O.—I am willing to admit that, so far as present appearances go, Russia is as likely to overpower China as she is to get possession of India.

UTOPIAN.—What a gigantic power Russia would be were she to become supreme both in Europe and Asia! In that case there would be only one other nation which

could be set against her—the United States of North America.

SIR O.—In the next great war in which Great Britain is engaged it is not unlikely that she will lose the Dominion of Canada, which will become a part of the United States. Sometime in the twentieth century the Pacific Ocean will become the scene of great naval conflicts. The British colonies will probably become independent nationalities whose fleets will command or try to command the vast commerce of the Pacific Ocean. Russia and the United States will contest this naval supremacy.

UTOPIAN.—Russia! What chance has she of becoming a naval power in the Pacific?

SIR O.—In a few years the trans-Siberian railroad will be completed. Then it will not be long before Persia will be absorbed by Russia, and a great naval station established in the Persian Gulf. The attack on Hindoostan may come from this quarter rather than Herat, supposed to be the key of India. England will lose the peninsula of Hindoostan before the year 1950.

UTOPIAN.—Will Russia remain an autocracy?

SIR O.—The form of its government must change. I think Western Europe will become a kind of Federal Republic; but of course a power which is dominant in Asia cannot tolerate democratic forms among such semi-civilized people as the Hindoos for instance. The governments of the future will be more complex than in the past. There are good points in Imperialism, Aristocracy, and Democracy; I should not be surprised if the Russian government of the future utilized all manner of governmental system in its administration of the affairs of Europe and Asia. Take the British government of

to-day. It is a constitutional monarchy in Great Britain, a despotic empire in India, and a practical democracy in the Dominion of Canada and the South Pacific colonies. Legislative government was tried in Jamaica; but it was a failure, and that island is now wisely governed by a crown-appointed executive.

UTOPIAN.—Do I understand you aright? Are you not a Democrat? Is not some form of representative government the ultimate good of all the nations? Will not despotism and privileged classes disappear before the close of the twentieth century?

SIR O.—I am not a *doctrinaire* as to forms of government. All political institutions, however opposite in their character, were adapted to certain social conditions. The ideal government will make use of all kinds of political machinery, autocratic, aristocratic, and democratic. I think, as I have already said, that the tendency is for governments to become more and more a factor in human affairs. And here, I judge, that Spencer's secondary law of evolution, viz.: "that progress is from a state of indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to definite, coherent, heterogeneity," comes into play. All fundamental law should be elastic enough to admit of the use of all governmental powers which are essential to the wise administration of human affairs. It is this plasticity which distinguishes all really great nations. Rome was a republic in which the powers of the state were divided between the plebeians and patricians; but when a serious war was on hand a dictatorship was declared and supreme power lodged in a commanding general. The United States could not crush the Confederate States under its Constitution. It fell back on the intangible war power, which was a mere legal fiction;

but it represented the life of the nation, using all its inherent powers to protect itself from destruction. It would be well for us to bear this fact in mind, that during our civil war our Federal Constitution was set aside. Happy is the nation which can adapt itself to circumstances and make use of any governmental form that will prolong its life and add to the happiness of its people.

UTOPIAN.—You take my breath away! What will all our Republicans and Democrats and individualists think of such doctrines? You will be regarded as a reactionary of the very worst type. Are not some forms of government better than others?

SIR O.—If my contemporaries think my vague utterances unsound, I appeal from them to the generation that will live at the close of the twentieth century. Of course some forms of government are better than others. Countries with free institutions are generally happier than those in which authority is concentrated in individuals or a class. My contention is that the ideal government of the future will be a complex one—that it will be plastic and will not have one rule applicable to all races and conditions of men. I think individual happiness will better be brought about by such a government than if the central authority fulfilled Herbert Spencer's ideal of simply maintaining peace and enforcing strict justice between all individuals.

UTOPIAN.—Have you no theory of your own as to the woman question, for instance? What will be the status of the female sex during the coming generation?

SIR O.—One can only say in a general way that the drift of things is towards the emancipation of women. In other words, there will be greater variety in their lives

and employments than there has been in the past. I am speaking not only of the modern civilized world, but I judge that the status of women is getting to be somewhat different among semi-civilized people. The rapid intercommunication of intelligence throughout the world insensibly influences all classes in all countries.

UTOPIAN.—Of course, from my point of view, the enlarged opportunities of women will be of great advantage to the sex, without injuring in any way the men. Their improved education and training will make them better wives and mothers. The female influence in politics will be refining. When women vote there will be an end to wars, the liquor traffic will be suppressed, and the social purity of women put legally upon a higher plan.

Sir O.—I wish I could be as hopeful as you are as to the final result of the woman movement. There is no disputing the extension of the influence of the female sex. Formerly they were wives and mothers, and the sphere of their industries was confined to the household; but the growth of the modern factory system took away the home employments of the mothers and daughters of the working part of the community. The great bulk of the women are now forced into the labor market, outside of their homes; they are competing with men in hundreds of employments formerly monopolized by the latter. This change undoubtedly has some advantages; but has it not destroyed the old ideal of the home, and may not its moral effect eventually be hurtful? A woman who can "paddle her own canoe" in the way of making a living can afford to set at nought in a measure the conventions of sexual morality. Look at the throngs of women in Paris who follow lives of pleasure, and do entirely as they like in dealing with men. Many are work-

ing-women, others are artists, actresses, and singers. What has often kept a woman pure is the fact that she did not care to mar her chances for marriage; which was the only way the vast bulk of the sex could assure themselves of support. But women who have occupations which give them food and clothing are under no such prudential restraints. Hence I apprehend that with the more varied employments of woman in industry, there will come some tolerance of conduct such as has always been condoned in men. This is the reason why I think that eventually in the sexual relations of the future the various forms of marriage, tested by sections of the race from time to time, will be found practically operative in the cities of our modern world.

UTOPIAN.—That statement to me is a libel upon the fair sex, and will be so regarded by your readers.

SIR O.—I doubt if the variations from monogamy, which I think I foresee in the future, will be as offensive as what we now call prostitution. You recall Burke's oft-quoted phrase about vice losing half its evil by losing all its grossness. The woman who can make her own living mingles some sentiment and romance in her intimate relations with the other sex. This saves her from the lowest depths of degradation. There are differences between the women who sell their persons for a living, and those who yield their affections or even caprices.

UTOPIAN.—I do not care to dwell on that phase of the subject. Will not the bulk of women remain pure in the sense we use the term; and will not their influence in politics be beneficial.

SIR O.—Women have shown to better advantage than men as monarchs—as rulers of great empires. But this was only when they ruled in their own right. The mis-

tresses of kings, and very often their queens, have proved hurtful to the state. I confess I should like to see the experiment of female suffrage tried in some settled State. I should decidedly object to making them voters over the whole Union without such preliminary experiments. Women are getting into politics quite rapidly enough. They vote for school offices, are being placed on school boards; they have their say in the public and private charities of the State. Even in conservative England, through their Primrose Leagues and other organizations, women take part in election contests. Still it seems to me that the part for a woman to play is that of wife and mother. Her real mission is to continue the race under the best possible circumstances. It is a question whether factory help, telegraphers, store clerks, waiters, and business women of all kinds live the kind of life which ensures the best progeny. Indeed I imagine that the more diversified are the employments of women, the stronger the tendency with them to shirk the responsibilities of maternity; hence the continuance of the race is not left to the educated, industrious, and highly trained women, but to the poor, the shiftless, and the stupid.

UTOPIAN.—When the relations of the sexes become normal will not the moral rule which obtains in the animal creation be the guide of the human race. There is no desire among beasts except in the rutting season. When the female is impregnated that is the end of the matter so far as the beasts are concerned. If we have a millennium will not that rule apply to men and women?

SIR O.—That view of the relation of the sexes has been advanced a thousand times by so-called social reformers; but it seems to me that man has made an enormous advance upon the beasts in making use of sex pos-

sibilities to add to his comfort and happiness. A beast has the sexual impulse once or twice a year; men and women are under its influence in one form or another nearly all the time; but what in the beasts is a mere momentary surge of passion, is to man only the beginning of a series of emotional pleasures, among the most delightful known to the race. From this tap-root, down if you will into the very mire of our nature, spring the family affections, the high ideals, the romance of our lives. The most exquisite flower, exhaling the most delicious perfume, is indebted for its beauty and charm to the root that is fed by the foulest manure. And so with the sexual instinct, which we share with the hyena and the goat. It has been utilized by man so as to sweeten and perfume his life. Let us hear no more about the sexual morality of the beasts.

UTOPIAN.—What a world of criticism some of the points you have made in this conversation will provoke.

SIR O.—I probably look at this matter from a point of view different from that of the average moralist; but those who know will testify that I have not lived an immoral life, and have never done any thing that would make my family ashamed of me. What I have been saying will seem like a truism fifty years from now.

IS A UNIVERSAL LANGUAGE POSSIBLE?

LINGUIST.—I believe, Sir Oracle, that the whole of civilized mankind is destined ultimately to speak the same tongue. It may take centuries to bring about this consummation; but, however long it takes, I think there can be no doubt of the final result.

SIR ORACLE.—I notice in this pretty prediction that you refer very vaguely to time. The matter of a mere century or so seems to make no difference to you. And, indeed, considering the amount of time you have at the disposal of your imagination, I see no reason why you should bother yourself over such a small matter as a few hundred years. All of us, however, have not eternity at our bidding. I, for one, am limited, in this book at least, to dealing with the tendencies of the immediate future. So I hardly think it right to inflict upon my readers the possible results of a thousand years from now.

LINGUIST.—Your conscience in this matter has all of a sudden become remarkably tender. There is a consideration, however, which may tend to toughen it. Suppose you confine yourself to the negative side of the conversation. Keep predicting constantly and positively that nothing which I say has any bearing on the immediate future. Your readers may get from you then that which by this time they must have learned to expect—forecasts which, to say the least, are doubtful.

SIR O.—Upon those terms, perhaps, I may consent to point our conversation. Say your say; but say it shortly.

LINGUIST.—In the past, amalgamation of language has been a common occurrence. Every modern language is a selection from a variety of different tongues and dialects. The words of the English vocabulary can be traced back to at least twelve different dialects, the users of which before the fusion took place could not understand one another. The French, Italian, and Spanish languages, now apparently so homogeneous, were originally as divergent as the English tongue. This gradual fusion, this welding into one form of speech, took place in periods of the world's history when there was not much travelling, and when neither ideas nor words could be quickly interchanged. To-day a thousand persons are on the road, fairly flying from point to point, where one changed his habitation in former centuries. Now I believe that the civilized world is gradually creating a common language. Every new dictionary contains words drawn from the speech of other nations. When Peter the Great taught his people shipbuilding and how to navigate the seas, he was forced to use Dutch and English technical words, as the Russian language had no equivalent terms to convey an idea of these novelties to the Russian people. And this process is constantly going on. We are borrowing from the French, Germans, Spaniards, and Italians, and they from us, and this fusion is being carried forward so rapidly that before the close of the twentieth century a universal dictionary will be published in which the entire world will find words that can be used anywhere.

SIR O.—Stop a bit and let me sift a little your confi-

dent remarks. It is quite true, as you say, that the increasing intercourse between the nations of the world leads to an interchange of words. It cannot help do otherwise. The French, when they adopt any thing from the English—such as the beefsteak, for instance—filch the name as well as the thing. Then there are certain phrases in every language that peculiarly fit the ideas they express, and familiarity with these phrases, such as is brought about by the healthy intercourse between one nation and another, leads to their cosmopolitan use. All this is true. But the limits of such an interchange are not hard to find; and when found they vitally hurt your argument. Such interchanges do not take place in the essential but only in the accidental elements of a language. However useful an Englishman may find such phrases as "jeu d'esprit," or "par excellence," he will always call bread "bread" and not "pain." And so it will be with the two or three thousand words in each language which constitute an ordinary man's vocabulary. I, for my part, cannot conceive of any good reply to this objection.

LINGUIST.—I can simply turn to the past. In the formation of any language, every dialect which went up to make it must each have had a word for the ordinary things and actions of life. Yet in the course of time one word was dropped and another selected. Take the case of the French language. In eight or nine hundred A.D. there were almost as many dialects in France as there were counties. Now in each of those counties they must have eaten bread and had a word for it. Yet at present bread is "pain" from the Pyrenees to the English Channel.

SIR O.—It is not very difficult to deal with that argu-

ment. It amounts to this: languages have become amalgamated in the past, hence they will become amalgamated in the future. Now obviously this is only true if the conditions in the future will be the same as they have been in the past. In some places doubtless they will. Nothing is more common in Africa at the present day than the creation, the fusion, and the extinction of dialects. But nobody will be wild enough to make the statement that the conditions of the civilized part of mankind are the same as those at present existing in Africa or those of a thousand years ago in France. This reply is so simple and plain that, important as it is, I can afford to pass it over with a few words. The fact that the leading nations of modern Europe, each and every one, have a literature, is sufficient in itself to make the prospects of a universal language shaky in the extreme, for a literature always creates rigidity of form. That is, the great authors of a nation are themselves the arbiters of the propriety or impropriety of a word, and so long as there is a standard of this kind but very little change is possible. Are we not continually urged by all good writers to avoid as we would the plague the barbarisms of modern vulgarity? And is it not perfectly right that we should follow their advice, and without becoming pedantic purists, at least be careful to keep the "well of English undefiled"? A language with a literature cannot change radically.

LINGUIST.—How about the Latin language? Did not that change radically in spite of Virgil and Lucretius?

SIR O.—Your question brings me to the second step in my argument. The Latin language has never changed; but the Roman nation has. The abiding character of a language must depend of course on the abiding character

of a people. Disintegrate a nation with a literature, and you do not destroy the literature; you only blot the common use of the language of that literature. A literature does not die, although its creator may. In other words, although the perpetuation of the use of a language in its pure form is conditioned on the perpetuation of the society which employs it, the perpetuation of the existence of that language depends upon nothing except the preservation of the manuscripts. It results from this plainly that the English of Byron, the French of Hugo, and the German of Goethe are as immortal as the human race. Nevertheless it is perfectly possible that the common use of these languages may disappear—that is, they may become dead as Latin and Greek are dead. But if ever this comes to pass, it will be only when England, France, and Germany no longer exist as separate nations.

LINGUIST.—But why should they continue to exist as separate nations? You yourself have predicted that Russia will overwhelm the rest of Europe. If your prediction is true, would there not necessarily be a fusion of languages, and the creation of a universal tongue, in which Russian would predominate? On that hypothesis a process would take place, similar to that which has already taken place in France. The present French tongue, as you have said, was at one time only one dialect among many in France. It happened that the people using this dialect—the inhabitants of the province called L'Ile de France—had the happiness of being the personal friend of the French king. As his power grew, the use of the present French became more common, until it finally was metamorphosed into the national tongue. If then Russia extended her power as the French kings have extended theirs, Russian would pass into

general use. For my part I do not believe that Russia will be able to overpower the rest of Europe. I believe that in the first place Europe would be too much for her in a possible struggle; and in the second place, that the days of conquest among the civilized nations are over. This, however, is all more or less a matter of conjecture. I prefer to base my argument on more substantial possibilities and less questionable tendencies. I was perhaps wrong in insisting on the importance of the change of words which arise from the intercourse as at present carried on between nations. But in the future will not the intercourse be close and firm enough to affect the essentials as well as merely the accidents of language?

SIR O.—Upon such a ground your position is certainly stronger; but still, in my opinion, by no means unassailable. Intercourse merely—as such—cannot at the present time bring about a fusion of tongues. No universal language can possibly become universally adopted until community of interest is so widespread that all merely national distinctions are effaced. At present the nations of Europe are a set of warring units, jealous of each other and grasping for power. It will not be until the interest of one nation and the interest of all nations become identical that the social conditions which are presupposed by a universal language will be found. As long as there is a protective tariff on earth, men will never speak the same tongue. Remember, then, before you again make the assertion with which you started this chapter, that before what you predicted can come to pass men must be protected by the same laws, actuated by the same motives, enlightened by the same religion.

LINGUIST.—Not so fast. You have been assuming all along that a language like a polity must grow. Why can

one not be made? We all know that it is perfectly possible to make a language. Leibnitz tried to construct one two hundred years ago; but his attempt was not successful because of the lack of sufficient data. Other people less noted, have also spent time on the subject. Stephen Pearl Andrews thought that there is a perfect language which needs only to be discovered. Every sound, he alleges, is charged with a meaning, which man will some day find out. The sounds under the head of "R" signify strife, contention, such as war, rough, riot, and the like, while the "L" sounds characterize the gentler emotions—love, luxury, languor, and so on. Now while it is true as a fact that there is an intimate relation between sound and sense, there is no reason to believe that a real universal language exists in any way that will allow us to discover it, but the instinct of the race, guided by its intelligence, may develop a language as much superior to the Greek or German as these are to the rude speech of the Australian savage. Then look at Volapük. Here we have a universal language already made, and well made too. See how many adherents it has already found, although it has been in existence only a little over six years. Whether Volapük is the language of the future I do not know, but why should not some creation of the kind be adopted by the universal consent of the civilized nations, and be taught in public schools, and used in public documents and private international transactions?

SIR O.—Alas! you might as well ask: "Why should not man become suddenly gifted with openness and flexibility of mind?" What you suggest could never come to pass, because the scheme would imply that men are under the influence of ideal considerations far more then they really are. The plan is too taking

and logical ever to be adopted. Moreover, as suggested, it would simply mean that there would be one more language to learn, for although a Volapük might conceivably be adopted for certain purposes by men of ideas, it could not hope to supplant the mother tongue until the necessity for a universal language is much more keenly felt than it is at present or is likely to be in the next two centuries. After all, what classes of people would need your logical language? Only travellers, diplomatists, and merchants, hardly one one-hundredth of the whole population. Very few persons need, to get on in life, more than their mother tongue. Then there would be the further difficulty about the selection of the universal language. If ever it was known that one was to be taught in the public schools, there would immediately be a thousand candidates for the place. I see that already Volapük has two or three rivals, and doubtless more may be expected. Who is to decide between them? A congress of philologists? Who can doubt that, considering the fact that philologists themselves would be the authors of all the candidates, such a congress would be so torn by internecine warfare that no decision could be come to.

LINGUIST.—But would not such a language be desirable?

SIR O.—Yes, just as desirable as the "prevalency of reason and the will of God." I am not, however, seeking for the desirable, but for the probable.

THE PROSPECT FOR ARCHITECTURE.

ARCHITECT.—Up to a recent date domestic architecture in this country was of a sombre and monotonous character. Our first private houses were three and four stories high, and the fronts were of brownstone. It was quiet and elegant, but the general effect was depressing. Lately a change has occurred. The centenary of our country, celebrated in Philadelphia in 1876, marked a new era, not only in house-construction, but in the internal decoration of our houses. It introduced the Queen Anne and other quaint as well as artistic forms of dwelling-houses.

SIR ORACLE.—Yes, and I notice that writers on art and architecture are criticising very severely this revolt against the monotony and elegance of the old-time brownstone fronts.

ARCHITECT.—All revolutions lead to some excesses, and that some members of my profession would abuse their liberty when they found patrons who would stand by them was to be expected. Now let any one inspect the houses constructed before this era of high colors and quaint forms, and I think the judgment will be that the architectural beauty of the city has been enhanced very greatly by our more advanced architects. No one can walk up Madison Avenue, east of the Central Park, and look to the right and left, up and down the side streets,

without feeling grateful to those who have effected such attractive changes over the old order of things. A person trained in the earlier canons of our art is naturally disturbed by the new domestic architecture of the day. It is the story of "the music of the future" over again; but Wagner will outlive his critics, and the newer combinations of form and color in our domestic architecture will be justified by future generations. By the way, what have you to say respecting the demand for a distinctively American style of architecture?

SIR O.—The architecture of the ancient world clearly had relation to the different nations which developed the various styles. Art is of all countries, and is a heritage of the race, but it manifests itself in varied forms to different peoples and ages. Certainly the Egyptian was not like the Assyrian or the Grecian. The Doric and the Ionic were separate manifestations to different branches of the Hellenes. Architecture down to modern times represented religious ideals. The Egyptian mausoleum, the Greek temple, the Mohammedan's mosque, and the Roman Catholic cathedral were all embodiments of certain religious conceptions. Modern times have given us no church architecture that is distinctive, because the modern world has developed no new religion. Our church edifices are all feeble copies of Pagan, Mohammedan, and Roman Catholic houses of worship.

ARCHITECT.—You don't quite answer my query. Your mission is to outline the future. Will we ever have an American style of architecture?

SIR O.—I was coming to that. Nearly all the noble architecture of the past was religious; that of the modern world is secular. Modern art is barren in dealing with sacred subjects; it now serves Humanity instead of the

unseen God. The Romans built the amphitheatre and the bath; the moderns erect the legislative chamber, custom-house, the bank, the post-office, and last, but by no means least, the apartment house. The temple of the Greek was for Zeus, Aphrodite, or Athene, but our noblest edifices are to house those who have been fortunate in the accumulation of power or wealth. It is, of course, absurd to expect a type of an American house equally suitable for Maine and Texas, Dakota and Florida. Climate is an important factor in determining the construction of abodes for human beings. This modern mission of art will, I think, be further emphasized in providing homes for the masses of our people. The isolated household, which gave room for one family, is being replaced by the great dwelling suitable for a hundred families. It is not well for man to live alone. For the play of all his faculties and his highest culture it is better for him to be surrounded by other human beings, who have something to give in the daily education of life as well as to receive. I venture to predict that the unitary homes will continue to be a feature in the architecture of the future. The skill, taste, and genius of architects will be called into play to provide living rooms for great numbers of human beings in one dwelling.

ARCHITECT.—I notice that some of the critics say that the Romans subordinated architecture to engineering.

SIR O.—In doing this and in building baths and coliseums the Romans took the first step to serving the race instead of imaginary gods. The temples of Nineveh, Babylon, Egypt, and Greece were not for human uses. Still one of the noblest works of Phidias was the treasure temple of Athene, wherein was kept the money of Attica,

But in those heroic times life and treasure were alike supposed to belong to the gods. Those illusions have vanished for ever, and for all practical purposes it is man who is now to be served by art. There can be no loss of dignity in submitting to the inevitable, and art, in serving the race and beautifying our habitations, must submit to mechanical conditions.

ARCHITECT.—But surely the members of my profession will not be confined to providing houses for the few or the many? Our skill will be sought for in other public works.

SIR O.—Yes, the same revolution which Wagner brought about in music is imminent in architecture. His theory was that the composer should be many-sided. He should not only produce the music, the libretto, the scenery, the action, the entire *ensemble*, but all its details should be the task of the composer, or rather of the artist. A work of art should be a whole; hence the architect of the future must also be many-sided. A great house should be a perfect poem, and all its details, from the original plan down to the decorative adornments, ought to be outlined by its designer. The outlying grounds, too, should be his conception. The laying-out of a landscape and great engineering works should be made beautiful by the artist, who, to be called such, must be something more than a mere planner of edifices, sacred or profane.

ARCHITECT.—Alas, where will the men of genius come from, capable of being artists in the sense in which you use that word?

SIR O.—They must be men of general ideas, who are not tied down to mere technical manipulation. The real artist will plan the work in its general features, and

avail himself of the labors of specialists to reduce his ideas to actualities.

ARCHITECT.—Should not critics treat architects tenderly? Is it not rather disheartening, when one has done his best, to be held up to public contempt, when perhaps the point at issue is a mere question of taste between the artist and his critic?

SIR O.—The average critic has been very severe upon painters who have not done good work. Yet these artists put their pictures in a gallery modestly, and no one need go to see them unless he wants to. But the architect obtrudes himself upon the public; his work challenges attention. It is a constant and ever-present example of good or evil in the way of art. Whoever plans a building to be seen of all men may as well understand first as last that he will be subjected to the most severe judgment. I believe our architects realize their responsibility, and I look forward to a great development of artistic skill as applied to public and private buildings, and the great engineering works intended to supply the necessities and add to the comforts of the human race.

ARCHITECT.—You do not believe then in any distinctively modern style of, say, church architecture?

SIR O.—There is a relation, as I have said before, between the creeds or faiths and the architecture to which they gave birth. The Grecian temple was designed for the procession of the priests, and the sacrifice at the altar. In other words, it was for a spectacle, the only music being chants. The Gothic cathedral was for the celebration of mass and for music, not for speaking. Preaching demands an auditorium, the sound of the human voice being the first condition for the architect

to keep in mind. Our modern church architecture is a jumble of all previous styles. The symbolism between the various religions and their church architecture has frequently been pointed out.

ARCHITECT.—But will not the race develop new faiths, which will embody themselves in appropriate material forms?

SIR O.—Very probably. The evolution of religion will involve many changes. Our nobler ideals will be embodied in the "frozen music" of architecture. But we are the heirs of all the ages; and our modern aim seems to be to utilize the types of all pre-existing forms of architecture, sacred and secular. Our best work must not be in erecting temples to an unknown god; but in providing the most artistic habitations that will serve the material and artistic wants of humanity. The triumphs of the modern world are its bridges, depots, markets, public buildings, palaces, and apartment houses—in other words, all the edifices which serve the secular purposes of the race, as well as those which satisfy its religious aspirations. Hence I do not look to any distinctive American style of architecture, for the structures of the future will be multiform. They will utilize all that was good in the past, as well as invent new forms which are more fitted for the present. The temple of humanity, the pantheons of the future, will far surpass any thing that has come down to us from the past.

CONCEITS ABOUT THE CURRENCY.

ECONOMIST.—The currency question will, I suppose, receive some sort of solution during the next century. Is there any data by which we can foreshadow what the final result will be?

SIR ORACLE.—It seems probable to me that before the close of the twentieth century there will be a unification of the coined money of mankind. Undoubtedly the French metric system of weights and measures will be recognized in all the markets of the world. The intimate trade communications between nations, which will be brought about by telegraph and telephone and other more efficient motors, will probably bring into existence a decimal currency, which will be recognized in all parts of the civilized world.

ECONOMIST.—Will it be necessary to use the precious metals to effect exchanges? Why not paper-*fiat*-money? An understanding among the several nations of the world would prevent the issue of too much currency; and the governments would soon learn about how much was needed to transact the business in each local state. As I understand it, the main objection to paper-*fiat*-money in the past was that it had no purchasing power outside of the nation which issued it or was responsible for it. Hence the dependence on gold and silver, because one or both of these metals is the recognized legal tender of all mankind outside of the savage tribes.

SIR O.—I do not believe the time will ever come when a piece of paper representing an imaginary dollar will be current in all parts of the world. The *fiat*-money agitation is a curious instance of how words are mistaken for things. As a matter of fact a dollar is so many grains of gold or silver; the law defining the proportion. Hence the basis of our currency is a physical fact. It is a substance which has weight and extension. But the dollar of the Greenbacker is a metaphysical entity. It is intangible; it is unaffected by the law of gravitation; and is unmeasurable by any mathematical formula You might as well attempt to measure values by a dream as by a *fiat* dollar. Mankind has not yet accepted the lesson taught by Hume the philosopher, that whatever has neither weight nor extension is nothing. Time and time again has paper money been issued, based upon the faith of the state, and irredeemable in the precious metals. The result has always been disastrous. The paper fiction is invariably killed by the fact that you cannot exchange something for nothing.

ECONOMIST.—It is an axiom in political economy that all trade is an exchange of products,—money being merely the measure of value of the goods bartered. Hence, money is only a yardstick. Will not the inventive genius of man hit upon some way of effecting exchanges without using so costly a machinery as that involved in the constant employment of the precious metals. Look, for instance, at the many devices now employed for effecting exchanges. Time was when the gold and silver coin had to be moved from one part of the earth to another in order to carry on trade. But the bill of exchange, which first made its appearance in the Italian republics of the middle ages, dispensed with the

necessity of these costly and dangerous transfers of real money. Then the institution of banks involved bank credits and checks; and now we have telegraphic transfers. So that we have only to pay the differences, which is a comparatively small sum compared with the vast aggregate of transactions. Note the clearing-houses in our large cities. They economize the use of actual cash enormously. By marking of debts against credits, transactions involving a hundred million dollars on both sides of the account can be settled with the transfer of a few thousand in cash. Now is it unreasonable to suppose that some device will be arrived at to dispense with the use of actual gold and silver in the commerce of the world?

SIR O.—I confess I once thought that in the fulness of time mankind might agree to use a currency based on the whole arable soil of the earth. I can never get rid of the idea that a currency, to be at all useful, must have some reality back of it. A word such as a dollar, for instance, is nothing; but the soil beneath our feet, and from which with labor we extract all that we eat and wear, would not be open to the objection of intangibility. A currency convertible into so much land ought to have a permanent value; but of course this was a mere theory, and perhaps a very wild one. It is true that something like this was tried in the case of the French Assignats, and it was a dismal failure; but my scheme would involve the agreement of all nations, and would have behind it the authority of every government on earth. In this year, 1888, we are testing a new departure in the way of currency. We are making use of paper, based dollar for dollar upon actual deposits of gold and silver in the government treasury. We are trying to use paper

exclusively for all sums of one dollar and over. I confidently predict that there is trouble in store for us in this disuse of actual gold and silver coin. After a few years people will become educated to paper money of different denominations. They will begin to say that it is absurd to keep permanently locked up hundreds of millions of gold and silver, which, if not used as currency, ought to be available for the arts. The tendency of mankind to mistake words for things will make itself felt; and the *fiat*-money theorists will again come to the front.

ECONOMIST.—May there not be some device invented for using gold and silver both in the arts, and for currency purposes?

SIR O.—Perhaps. The necessities of trade may force the bankers and merchants of the future to hit upon some way of meeting this difficulty when it arises, as arise it will. On one point I think the currency theorists are mistaken. They argue that the use of bills of exchange, bank credits, and clearing-houses does away with the necessity for using silver as well as gold for a measure of values; but the steady fall in prices since the partial demonetization of silver, and the consequent distress in all the marts of trade, is proof enough for me that the great and growing commerce of the world demands not only all the gold and all the silver that is procurable, but all the paper devices as well, which, while temporarily taking the place of the precious metals, are finally convertible into them. The world cannot have too much real money, and the distress in all departments of industry since 1871 seems to me to be due to the under-production of real money, at a time when there was an apparent over-production of unsalable goods.

ECONOMIST.—You speak of the relative over-produc-

tion. Is it not true that more goods are often produced than the world has need for?

SIR O.—Since man has been upon this planet, there was never a time when there was too much food or clothing for the race. There are always millions of bare backs and hungry bellies. There have, of course, always been certain individuals or classes which had more money than they could use on the necessaries of life, but the economists who talk of over-production, except in a relative sense, do not know what they are talking about. The problem of the race is to keep on producing until there is food and clothing and shelter for all. The very best that mankind can expect for several generations is that their barest physical necessities will be satisfied. The problem for all nations is to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked. Hence I have regarded all who would demonetize either gold or silver as the enemies of the human race, for the under-production of money would be likely to bring about a reaction in prices, which may put a stop to production.

ECONOMIST.—But let us "return to our muttons." You have not yet told us what the currency of the twentieth century will be.

SIR O.—I have at least pointed out what it will *not be*. Paper-*fiat*-money has no future, though we may have to undergo another terrible experience to prove that fact. The currency of the future will be based on something tangible, not on an idea or a definition. We will continue to employ all the devices now in use to economize and utilize the precious-metal reserve of the world, and doubtless more machinery will be invented having this same object in view. I think something will happen in the next ten years to restore silver to the status it had

when bi-metallism was the rule on the continent of Europe. This may not be through the formal remonetization of silver by the European powers. It may come about through the enrichment of the silver-using people of China, Hindoostan, Russia, and Central and South America. We should remember that nine tenths of mankind use silver exclusively, and if the gold mono-metallic countries keep on impoverishing themselves by their monetary policy, the silver-using world will be advantaged, and the value of the white metal will go back to its old ratio of fifteen and one half to one. That will mark an era of great prosperity throughout the world. The improvement of the physical condition of the people of Russia, China, Hindostan, and South America is undeniable. The United States has made great progress since it partially remonetized silver. The nation which has the gloomiest outlook is gold, mono-metallic England. That country is losing its command over the markets of the world, and London its pre-eminence as the banking centre of international commerce.

TRUSTS, CORPORATIONS, AND GOVERNMENT WORK.

MERCHANT.—You have been saying that trusts are a natural evolution from pre-existing industrial conditions, and that on the whole corporations have been beneficial to the community at large. Yet almost in the same breath you call upon the government to do many things now undertaken by corporations because, you say, the latter are monopolizing and care more for their officers and stockholders than they do for the community.

SIR ORACLE.—There is a good as well as a bad side to all human institutions. The association of capitalists to perform work which individuals, however rich, have not the means or ability to do is an excellent thing in itself. But when organizations of this kind take advantage of their positions to charge exorbitant profits they become a detriment to the public weal. A corporation to build a railroad and manage it, is, under our modern conditions, necessary, and ought not to be objectionable ; but when these same organizations bribe legislatures so as to get special privileges and charge extravagant freights and fares they become harmful and should be restrained. The construction of the first transcontinental railroads was a creditable piece of work in itself, but when the companies charged five hundred million dollars for improvements that cost them less than a hundred million

dollars they became a gigantic enemy to the public. The Credit Mobilier, the construction company which built the Union Pacific roads, in addition to charging altogether too much for its services to the public, corrupted Congress, and brought disgrace upon many statesmen who held high positions. It is this abuse of corporate power and privileges which is to be guarded against by a free press and an enlightened public opinion.

M.—Yet I see you are constantly arguing that the state should undertake public works which are in the nature of natural monopolies. You have often said you believed that the great corporation of the nation can do some things very much better than associations of private persons; but is it not true that governments in the past have proved incompetent to manage any thing like business in an efficient and economical way? Is not the prejudice against its doing any thing beyond keeping the peace founded upon the bitter experiences of the past?

SIR O.—Again the rule holds good that all human institutions are imperfect; they work well for a time, but their shortcomings make their appearance eventually. The history even of religions shows that they have their bad as well as their good influences. In one age the church is a mighty civilizing influence, in a succeeding generation it becomes a persecuting agency and demoralizes instead of elevating the race. I hold that any government is better than no government. When there is danger of anarchy mankind instinctively falls back on despotism as preferable. Now, as a matter of fact, governments have proved very efficient in many great departments of human activity. Take war, for instance, which has been the main business of mankind since the beginning of history, what could individuals or private

confederations do if pitted against the armies of an organized state? Mankind naturally honors great monarchs and able ministers and statesmen, for such rulers are the very salt of the earth.

M.—But let us come down to particulars. What kind of works can governments do better than private corporations?

SIR O.—Corporate enterprises generally have a selfish aim. Their great object is to make money or to secure power for the officers or stockholders interested. Governments, after all, must have public objects in view, they are under no obligation to do business for a profit, hence they are so far disinterested. True, their agents may be dishonest and may abuse their positions to exploit the community. History is full of such abuses on the part of those in authority. Take a familiar instance and compare the work of a government and that of a corporation. How wonderfully cheap and efficient is our post-office department! The same remark is true of all post-offices in all organized modern communities. How rarely does a letter miscarry and how trifling is the cost of sending one. Express companies in this country undertake a somewhat similar work. They are efficient, it is true, but very much more costly. How heavy are the charges for packages sent to any distance! In Great Britain and on the Continent the post-office departments undertake to do the work performed by the express companies in this country, but the charges for packages and goods sent is not one tenth the sums paid to our express companies. The governments of Great Britain, France, Belgium, and Holland do not want to make any profit in performing a public service, but our express companies are owned by stockholders who must have their dividends. Then each

organization has its officers, clerks, messengers, and agents, all of whom are well paid. A great deal of this money is saved when government undertakes the task of sending packages through the post-office. Any one who has travelled abroad is struck with the curious fact that the post-office delivers barrels of flour and potatoes, carcases of animals, huge cheeses, assortments of goods of all kinds on which are charges of less than the ordinary freight rates of the railroads—for governments can make better bargains with transportation lines than can private individuals or corporations.

M.—What other departments of business could government occupy with advantage to the community?

Sir O.—The telegraphic service abroad is more efficient and cheaper than the same work done in this country by corporations. Then on the Continent it is the governments which generally own and control the railroads.

M.—There you must confess that the private corporations of Great Britain and the United States show to advantage with government ownership and control.

Sir O.—I don't admit any thing of the kind. It is quite true that the railroad corporations are more enterprising than government officials are likely to be. They give better cars, swifter trains, and sometimes cheaper service; but roads managed by a responsible government, such as that of Germany or Belgium, are safer to travel on, and are very much cheaper in the matter of freight. It is a standing complaint of the English manufacturers that their German rivals have a great advantage over them because the government of that country favors trade in every way, whereas the English railroad corporations think mainly of profit. But the community benefits enormously in another way by government ownership of

the transportation lines. The profits in running the railway system find their way into the national treasury, which helps to reduce all taxation. This is why Germany can maintain such a mighty army, for the money which adds to the strength of that state, in this country and England is poured into the coffers of private capitalists. There are no Jay Goulds or Vanderbilts or great railroad millionaires in Germany, or indeed anywhere on the Continent. We impoverish the national treasury to add to the fortunes of private individuals.

M. You think, then, that the city authorities in the future will do many things now relegated to private corporations?

SHAW. When we have civil-service reform and electoral reform I have no doubt but that our cities will do many things which now would be regarded as out of their sphere. What, after all, is more efficient than our fire and police departments; then look at our Croton water supply; even our street-cleaning bureau does its work very well. Our health board promises to do excellent service. Compare these city departments with the gas services, the horse-car lines, or the ferries. The corporations they represent overcharge and abuse the public in every way. If the city of New York had its own gas service; if it owned the electric lights it uses, the ferries and the horse-car lines, it would have paid up its debt and had a hundred million to its credit. When any one talks of the inefficiency of the general government, or of the city, it would be well to call to mind our post-office department, our police, our fire, and our water supply right here in New York. Of course, it would be absurd for government to engage in trade. It cannot manufacture or distribute goods, but it ought to

control all natural monopolies and those departments of human activity in which there can never be any competition.

M.—I suppose the moral of this conversation is that the tendency of things is towards the assumption of new duties by the nation, the state, and the city. In other words, centralization is the watchword of the future—all public work to be done by the public authorities.

SIR O.—That would seem to be the lesson taught by current events.

WHAT WILL BECOME OF THE MIDDLE CLASSES?

TRADER.—From remarks in various of your conversations I judge, Sir Oracle, it is your belief that the wealth of the nation is passing into fewer hands, and that in the fulness of time the community will be divided mainly into two unequal classes—a few very rich people, a vast mass of wage-receivers, and, compared with the present, a relatively small middle class.

SIR ORACLE.—Yes, that states pretty fairly my forecast of what will result from the trade and industrial changes which are now going on. It seems to me the tendency is to increase the number of actual workers and to do away with the necessity for so many manufacturers, merchants, and brokers. The big fish in the business world are eating up the little ones. Of course this remark does not apply to the professional, literary, and artistic classes. We shall always want plenty of lawyers, doctors, writers, and artists. Their influence also will increase as the numbers and importance of the middle class decrease. Auguste Comte, you remember, in his scheme of a new society, made the poets, artists, and philosophers priests of humanity. They were not to have wealth, but were to control or rather represent public opinion, and stand between the patricians who own the wealth and the plebeians who did the work of

the world, proclaiming to each the doctrine of duty and setting before both higher ideals of life than those suggested by their business experiences or egotistic propensities.

TRADER.—All this is a dream. What makes you think the middle class is passing away relatively, a few becoming very rich, but the bulk dropping back into the ranks of labor?

SIR O.—It seems to me that every modern improvement and all the inventions of the age tend to cheapen exchanges and to reduce profits. We once had a class of wealthy tea merchants in the United States. The difference in price between Hong Kong and Boston often gave a fortune to the trader who put his venture into one shipload. But the extension of the electric cable to China put an end forever to exceptionally large profits, for the Chinese seller knew to a penny the price of tea in all the markets of the world as well as the European and American buyer did. Electric international communication has cut down profits in trade in every direction. Steam communication has had the same effect. The marked feature of this age of trade and competition is the smaller margin of profit both for manufacturer and merchant, as well as for all who stand between the actual producer and the actual consumer.

TRADER.—Does it not seem to you an undesirable state of things when wealth is massed in fewer hands and the bulk of the middle class is forced to go to work, while those that remain will not be paid more than the better class of workingmen?

SIR O.—Our conversations will not alter the facts, nor is it my business either to deplore or look hopefully on the tendencies of things. The moral of the situation is

that society should look favorably on all measures which would raise the standard of comfort of the working or wage-receiving classes. Their bitterest enemies to-day are these same middle-class people—that is, the small employers of labor, whether manufacturers or merchants. It is they who favor long hours of labor and low wages, and who have made the daily press solid against the best interests of the working classes.

TRADER.—Still you have not proved your point, that the middle class is disappearing. Every poor man in the West who takes up a homestead or goes in debt for one hundred and sixty acres of land in time becomes one of the middle class. With every new town or settlement there grow up land-owners, merchants, and manufacturers, who are constantly recruiting the same class.

SIR O.—What you say is true enough. And the middle class will be recruited in the ways you mention for the next thirty to fifty years; but I insist that the larger commercial movements of the age in all civilized countries are tending to mass wealth in fewer hands and to decrease the numbers and influence of the middle classes. Look at the great stores in all the capitals of the world! The public was startled, when it was first stated that A. T. Stewart's store, when he was alive, represented over five hundred bankrupted tradesmen. But now, instead of one Stewart store, there are probably five hundred, taking in the leading capitals of the world. These have driven out the small storekeeper, because they can give a better article for a lower price. Then what is the meaning of the great corporation and the trust—the latter a business development of the past few years? These—wielding great capital—can serve the community more efficiently and more cheaply than can a

swarm of manufacturers and merchants with their retainers. The trust, as I have pointed out, is a labor-saving machine. One Standard Oil Company replaces two or three thousand superfluous and costly middlemen. The brain-work of the business world is destined in time to be represented by a very few great firms, who will practically be in control of the wealth of the several nations.

TRADER.—I judge you are too sweeping in your generalizations. Surely the world has been civilized mainly by the middle class. It is they who gave us the Italian Republics of the Middle Ages, who liberalized Europe, and who have been the mainstay of our own republican institutions. The aim of the German Empire is to develop its manufacturing and mercantile classes; and the great want of Russia is a wealthy middle class above the peasants, one capable of influencing the official and court life of the Russian government.

SIR O.—Still the economic fact remains that the great class which has stood between the producers and consumers, helping neither and living off of both, has been, as it were, a sponge absorbing the wealth of the country, and using it for their own selfish purposes. The man who lives on rents, on the dividends of railroad companies and corporations, who lends his money out at interest, who makes goods or sells them in a small way, is substantially a parasite. He toils not, neither does he spin; but in past ages he has been the favored member of society. Now I do not say this in any communistic sense, for these middlemen have been necessary in their time and have helped forward the evolution of the race. They have been the patrons of literature and art; and the mainstay of much of the civilization of the world.

But they have had more than their proper share of the property of the community. They have thriven at the expense of the real producers of the wealth of the world. The English Parliament, for instance, has represented the aristocratic and trading classes of Great Britain down to within a few years. Its legislation in regard to the wages of labor, is difficult to characterize. It has been contemptibly mean for fully six hundred years. For proof of this statement, read Gunton's "Wealth and Progress." But the point I wish to make is that when labor is properly remunerated there will be smaller profits for the middle classes. Then, I think, the workers can make better terms with the millionaires and the billionaires than they have been able to do with the owners of thousands.

ANENT THE LABOR QUESTION.

KNIGHT OF LABOR.—Suppose we discuss the labor question, not with a view to taking sides for or against either the workingmen or their employers; but to try and think out if possible what the wage receivers may expect to happen to them in the future.

SIR ORACLE.—It will be difficult to discuss this matter impartially without running counter to very strong prejudices; but I will try to look at the facts just as they are. There is undoubtedly a feeling among the people who do the world's work that their condition ought to be bettered. They see a great growth of wealth; and a marvellous number of new inventions for economizing labor. They think that they ought to be better treated. Now, as a matter of fact, the condition of the working people has been greatly improved in the last fifty years. They are better fed, housed, and clothed than were their forefathers. Their children are educated at public expense; and they have more art and recreative advantages. Still they are any thing but satisfied. They are, in fact, discontented. Hence there is a dangerous ferment among them in all modern civilized countries. Our business is to try and tell what the outcome of all this will be.

K. OF L.—The workingmen, you will bear in mind, were the first to call into question the theories of the English political economists. They found that unre-

stricted competition was for them simply murderous. The Parliamentary investigations as to the mining and manufacturing population of England, when *laissez-faire* had full swing, is one of the most hideous pages in the industrial history of the race. For self-protection the workmen were forced to organize trades-unions. They did so, not only against the bitter opposition of the political economists, but of the whole literary class. The pages of the English journals for nearly fifty years teemed with libels on the workingmen and their trade organizations. This animosity has been paralleled of late years by the press of the United States, which is always on the side of the capitalist. But in England, Parliament finally moved in the matter, and notwithstanding the opposition of the employers and the political economists, the latter headed by names so distinguished as John Bright and Richard Cobden, laws were passed prohibiting child-labor; limiting the number of hours men or women might toil; and finally legalizing the organizations of the trades-unions. Fifty years ago, the English workingman labored fifteen or sixteen hours a day. Nine hours and a half a day is now the legal limitation. Yet the industry of England has prospered during all that time. But there is danger that the trades-unions have a hard time before them. They have undertaken to be charitable societies, and to maintain their members while sick and out of work. As a consequence, they have been greatly weakened. The Knights of Labor, as you know, have been organized to do for the unskilled laborers what the trades-unions have done for the skilled artisans. By uniting all classes of unskilled workmen it was hoped that the whole mass could be elevated.

SIR O.—And you have found that so far the experi-

ment has been a failure. The press has been opposed to you; and the great "sympathetic" strikes have miscarried.

K. of L.—What is your solution of the labor problem?

Sir O.—I hardly like to state it, for it may be a Utopia. I have had the notion that perhaps a religion of humanity was necessary to affect so vast a body as the wage receivers, who indeed form the bulk of our population. I feel quite clear that *laissez-faire*—the doctrine of every one for himself and the devil take the hindmost—is not a solution of the question, nor is trades-unionism, for while these labor organizations have done some good in Great Britain and the United States, they do not help the unskilled workman, and often are as unjust and arbitrary in their actions as are the capitalists who employ them. So far you Knights of Labor have made but small progress.

K. of L.—There is coöperation; what have you to say to that?

Sir O.—So far coöperation has been successful only in the field of distribution; but it has been of no value even in that province outside of England. Retail trade in England, Wales, and Scotland was in an unnatural state. The aristocratic way of doing business involved long credits. The goods for household use in great families were bought by housekeepers and stewards. This involved "tips" and bad credits. Consequently inordinate prices were charged. Here was the chance for the coöperative store. By adopting the cash principle, abolishing all commissions and "tips," buying goods by wholesale, it could furnish its membership with groceries and other commodities at very cheap rates, and even then make very good profits. Thus they were

enabled to turn their capital several times a year, while the old retail concerns could not turn theirs more than once. A. T. Stewart introduced about the same method of transacting business into the United States, and this has effectually prevented the success of the coöperative store among us. They have been tried a thousand times, and have always failed. His principle was one price, and for cash. This is why trade has been centring in our large capitals in concerns like Wanamaker's, of Philadelphia; Macy's and Ridley's, in New York, and Jordan & Marsh, in Boston. When you can get a good article for a low price in a retail store, there is no opening for a coöperative establishment. The latter always labors under the disadvantage of having many managers. Councils of war can never conduct campaigns as well as generals who understand their business?

K. of L.—But would it not be desirable if all labor could be organized on a coöperative basis.

SIR O.—The one business that man has pursued since the beginning of his history has been killing his neighbors in war. He has found that to do this successfully he must have leadership. A dozen able generals in consultation are not as efficient as one bad general having supreme control. The organization of the army has been found desirable not only in the state, but in all industry. When armies command their generals and ship crews their captains, I will believe in coöperation, but not until then. But practically in productive industry it is safe to say that coöperation has never succeeded.

K. of L.—Would it not be desirable if it were feasible?

SIR O.—I have never thought so. Productive cooperation would involve the organization of groups of skilled workmen, who would produce goods in order to

get all the profits, which now go to the capitalist or middleman. It would affect only a small minority of the working classes. Unskilled labor would be left out in the cold altogether. The curse of our present competitive system is that the able, the enterprising, and the lucky, by a process of selection, are sifted out to become rich at the expense of the rest of the community. Successful coöperation would merely add to the number of these lucky ones. No solution of the labor problem is worth any thing which does not favorably affect the whole body of wage receivers.

K. of L.—I suppose that is why you favor laws reducing the hours of labor, and those which affect the sanitary conditions of towns and factories, as well as those which provide for the education of the common people?

SIR O.—Yes, the tendencies of governmental action is to benefit the mass of the community, hence free roads, recreative parks, public libraries, and art galleries. The nation must concern itself with the well-being of the community, and is doing so in all civilized countries.

K. of L.—What have you to say about socialistic schemes?

SIR O.—I doubt if any change in the machinery of society is practicable. I said something about a religion of humanity at the beginning of this conversation. What I meant was that there should be a change of public feeling; that the capitalist should be told that the wealth he held was not entirely his own. It represented the accumulated toil of many men. Hence the Jay Goulds, Vanderbilts, and Astors should consider themselves the trustees of society. They should use their wealth for social ends. They are not asked to be charitable, but only that their wealth should be so used

as to keep people employed, irrespective of the necessities of the workmen. If there was a public opinion to enforce this view upon our employing class, the labor question would be solved. There would be no necessity for coöperation, trades-unions, or Knights of Labor.

K. of L.—Does not this look like a Utopia again?

SIR O.—Perhaps you are right. We can only judge the future by the past. The better condition of the laboring people has been, in large part, due to direct government action in shortening the hours of labor. The great mechanical inventions of the age have also helped: but I do not see that coöperative or socialistic machinery can be depended upon to improve the condition of the toiling masses. The instinct of the common laborer is right. He wants more pay for fewer hours of labor. Our industrial history shows that as the hours of work have been shortened the price of labor has advanced.

AS TO IRRIGATION.

NEVADIAN.—I see that Major Powell is urging one of the committees of the House of Representatives to recommend an appropriation for testing a national system of irrigation in the region between the Missouri River and the Pacific Ocean. He thinks the time has come when great reservoirs should be established to collect water, wherewith to fertilize the now sterile hundreds of millions of acres in the far West.

SIR ORACLE.—This would be a very wise thing to do, but I fear it will not be attempted in our generation. Any one who has travelled in Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, or California must have been struck with the magical results of irrigation. Take the valley, for instance, in which Salt Lake City is situated. Nothing could have been more forbidding than the character of the ground before the waters were collected from the snow-clad surrounding mountains to give life and beauty to the parched and burning soil. That once sterile valley is now a fruitful garden of all kinds of vegetation.

NEV.—This being so, why should not the people of the United States be willing to add to the national wealth by entering upon the work of collecting the waters with a view of utilizing them for agricultural purposes? Every ten dollars so spent would add a thousand to the actual wealth of the country.

SIR O.—The political training of the American people makes it impossible for any government which represents their views to engage in any such vast works of public utility. To achieve the best results this must be a national work. Neither the snow-clad mountains nor the arid plains of the West pay any attention to State lines. The work cannot be efficiently done by local organizations, either county supervisors or States. Yet what an outcry would be raised if it was proposed that the general government should undertake this enterprise! All the States east of the Missouri and Mississippi rivers would object to being taxed for inaugurating such irrigating works, although it could be easily proved that they would repay the outlay one hundred times over. Then how our fool newspaper editors would roar with indignation at the possibility that the politicians, aided by the contractors, might do some stealing! True, if private enterprise should undertake the business the loss to the community would be fifty times greater; but any consideration such as that would be beneath the notice of our journalists.

NEV.—I suppose we shall have to depend on private enterprise. Companies will be formed which will collect water to irrigate certain regions; but the work will lack system, and give birth to monstrous and hateful monopolies. Any such thing as competition would necessarily be out of the question. The companies supplying the water can make their own terms, and the farmers will be their slaves. All the arguments against land monopoly apply with even greater force to water monopoly of this kind.

SIR O.—Among the improvements of the past which have come down to us are the irrigating works in India,

some of the islands of the Pacific, and in various parts of Asia. Great Britain is doing a good work in reconstructing some of the old reservoirs and aqueducts of the Indian peninsula. The ancient Egyptians constructed artificial lakes and reservoirs to receive the surplus waters of the Nile when the flood was excessive, to be utilized in dryer seasons. We should do this with our own Ohio and Mississippi. It would add thousands of millions to the agricultural value of the lands of the Ohio and Mississippi valleys if our government followed the example set by the monarchs of Egypt thousands of years ago ; but it shows the force of powerful illusions and false theories of government action when so important a matter is not even seriously considered. For one series of years we have droughts which ruin the crops in the Ohio and Mississippi valleys. Then follows a series of years when there are inundations which destroy valuable lives and crops that are worth millions. These alternate seasons of drought and flood are known to be due to the wasteful cutting down of the timber on the banks and at the headwaters of the streams which feed the "Father of Waters." Reforesting these now treeless regions would be of incalculable benefit to the whole country. But to do this would involve national action, and that our Jeffersonian theory of government will not permit.

NEV.—But surely this state of things will not continue always. The contest for the integrity of the nation was fought in defiance of all our theories of government, and without the sanction of our Constitution. We all know the result. If nothing but the nation can cope with the defects of nature, will not our people eventually take a common-sense view of the matter?

SIR O.—Not, I am afraid, until we have suffered very greatly from following false gods. These irrigating projects you speak of ought to be undertaken by the general government, but that cannot be expected. Private corporations are already in the field to supply the demand for water in arid districts. They will prove immensely profitable, and for the next forty years they will yield untold wealth to a new crop of millionaires. In the past, land was the basis of wealth, and the means by which great fortunes were amassed. In all ages merchants and traders enrich themselves by exacting commissions from producers and consumers. The latter part of the nineteenth century witnessed the growth of a new class of very rich men, made so by corporate profits, largely those of railway companies; but I confidently predict that a new class of wealthy men will soon make their appearance, whose great fortunes will be due to the fact that the nation will permit them to monopolize water privileges which are essential to farmers in the far West. The latter will be exploited to aggregate wealth into few hands. It is thus that private enterprise usually gets the start of the general public. The average man is always rather stupid, and in this case our political traditions favor the monopolist at the expense of the community.

NEV.—There is another work which governments ought to undertake. We are subject to a plague of grasshoppers, which visits the West every seventeen or eighteen years. They were very destructive in 1875, and are due again in 1889. They promise to ruin the cereal crops of the Northwest. There is only one way to get rid of them, and that is to turn over the soil and cultivate the grounds which are their primary breeding-places. We

who live in the grasshopper country can point out the localities whence this destructive pest will issue in countless numbers. Every thousand dollars spent in turning over the soil they start from would save millions.

SIR O.—We shall have to suffer another year of depredation before you could induce an American Congress to provide against this evil. I judge that some time in the not distant future an entire change of sentiment as to what the government may do will be experienced by the American people. The late Stephen Pearl Andrews in accounting for radicals who became conservative in their old age, and conservatives who are converted to liberal views,—such as William E. Gladstone,—invented the phrase "a terminal conversion into opposites." An example he gave was that of a caterpillar which would climb a stick, and when he could get no higher, crawl down again on the opposite side. England was only recently the very apostle of free trade—unrestricted bargains and unlimited competition; yet it has been forced to pass laws limiting the hours of labor—that is, interfering in free bargaining between capitalists and laborers. The Gladstone land laws are a direct state interference with free contracts between landlords and tenants. England has nationalized its telegraphs, opened government savings-banks, and started life insurance, all of which is in open defiance of the canons of English political economy. So I judge this country will in time come to see the wisdom of using all the power of the people for the benefit of the people. Then will the Federal government utilize our great national advantages. It will reforest the waste places, provide reservoirs to hold the surplus waters of its rivers, and thus keep a supply on hand for seasons of drought. There

would then be a national system of irrigation, and such plagues as that of the locust swarms would be put an end to. All this and more besides ought to be the work of the twentieth century. Then the headwaters of all our great rivers ought to be reforested under the auspices or under the general direction of the Federal government. As in Europe, no one should be allowed to cut down a tree without planting another in its place. Our wasteful destruction of forests is almost a crime against the generations that are to follow us. But perhaps I am indulging in a Utopia.

JOURNALISM AS IT IS AND WILL BE.

JOURNALIST.—What is to be the future of the book, the magazine, and the weekly and daily periodical press? There must, doubtless, be as many changes in the future as in the past, and certainly the world of literature has changed very greatly within the last two hundred years.

SIR ORACLE.—In discussing this important matter there are several things to be kept in mind. The number of readers of books and periodicals is steadily and largely increasing the world over. From this it follows that there will be a greater variety of publications, which will appeal to widely diversified tastes. Hence there will be a specialization in literature, of which we have a foretaste in the press of to-day. Time was when our periodicals were like a cross-road country store. They aimed to satisfy all the news wants of the community, as the store does the every-day requirements of its immediate neighborhood. The leading city journals of thirty or fifty years ago, in addition to opinions on current politics, and the publication of the news of the world, tried to report all the markets. This last is now more satisfactorily done by special trade papers.

JOURNALIST.—Your reference to the country store recalls the fact that, as the towns grew, there was a specialization, which resulted in dry-goods, boots and shoes, hats, hardware, and groceries being sold at separate es-

tablishments; but the last phase of retail traffic is the re-appearance, in our large cities, of the country store enormously magnified. A woman shopper can go to the *Bon Marché*, in Paris, to Whiteley's, in London, to Jordan, Marsh, & Co., in Boston, Wanamaker's, in Philadelphia, and to corresponding establishments in all the great capitals in the world, and buy within its walls literally every thing she or her family may need. Now is it not likely that something analogous will take place in the newspaper world? Will not certain great journals endeavor to supply the public appetite for news as well as give entertaining reading matter, which now has to be gathered from many sources?

SIR O.—I believe it is a fact that there are fewer daily journals in London to-day than there were thirty years ago. There is a tendency to monopoly in the newspaper world as in trade. A man comes to the front in a newspaper, who has good business sense. He knows instinctively what readers want, and hence his journal gets the largest list of subscribers and the most advertising patronage. The average New Yorker, for instance, in making out his list of newspapers, will have at his breakfast-table the journal which he thinks is the soundest in its views on general topics, and which furnishes him with the news in the most attractive way. On leaving his daily business he will pick up that evening paper which gives the news of the day in a taking manner. Then the same head of the family has his trade journal, his religious and literary weekly, and, perhaps, a couple of monthly magazines. This is about as much reading as the average business man cares for. But on Sunday he has more time to read, and so the Sunday editions of all our papers in the leading cities furnish two or three

times more matter—much of it of a miscellaneous character—than they do on week-days.

JOURNALIST.—What criticism have you to urge against the daily press as at present organized?

SIR O.—That is a large question, and one which ought to be answered exhaustively. But there is no way of getting a criticism on the press before the public. Newspaper editors and owners do not propose to "foul their own nests," and as they control the organ which communicates directly with the public, the truth about the newspapers is rarely told, and never enforced.

JOURNALIST.—Suppose you outline a few of the shortcomings of the press.

SIR O.—To begin with, they are business enterprises; their primary object is to live and make money. It would seem that the way to do this would be to give the news fully, and to pass fair judgments upon current events in the editorial columns; and, undoubtedly, no paper can be really great or popular unless it fulfils these conditions. But readers of newspapers have prejudices and passions, advertisers have to be kept in mind, and then the real owner of the paper has business or political aspirations. These considerations influence editorial writers, and it is instinctively felt that unreasonable and widespread prejudices must be catered to, and popular passions inflamed rather than calmed. There was no newspaper, for instance, to object to the atrocious hanging of Mrs. Surrat, and they all hounded on the authorities at Chicago to execute the Anarchists—a proceeding which, I think, the common-sense of the future will pronounce unwise. On one of the burning questions of the day, that of labor, the press is unanimously ranged on the side of capital. It does not give the dumb toil-

ing millions any sort of a show. The reason for this is obvious. Newspapers represent invested capital. The owner of the most unimportant daily or weekly paper is an employer of labor, and instinctively takes ground against the workingmen. This is as true of the press of England, France, and the Continent, as of America. The only friends of the laboring classes are the philosophers and some college professors. Auguste Comte and John S. Mill befriended the laborer, and sundry writers in some of our American colleges also give the claims of the working people a really fair consideration.

JOURNALIST.—You have not mentioned one shortcoming of the press, its preference for sensational news rather than for the discussion of topics which would improve and refine the general readers.

SIR O.—That is a defect which in my opinion cannot very well be cured. All history deals with exceptional or, if you please so to call it, sensational incidents: that is, wars, scandals, catastrophes of some kind or another. It is sickening to take up a newspaper and read of murders, or of railroad and marine disasters, the abandonment of wives by their husbands, and *vice-versa*. Now the recital of these exceptional occurrences gives a false idea of the social life of the last part of the nineteenth century. But it must be confessed that the readers' taste craves this kind of literary pabulum, yet it certainly gives distorted views of human life.

JOURNALIST.—But is there not a new departure in the writing of history, which tells of the growth and social life of the people, and which does not dwell on battles or the scandals of court life. Green's "Short History of the English People," and McMaster's annals of our own country are cases in point. Why not a newspaper with

the same object in view, if that is to give contemporary history in an intelligent way. We live in a wonderful world and in a marvellous age; surely photographs of the really important events of our time would have an audience fit, even if few.

SIR O.—There is a great deal of our periodical literature which even now fills that field. Take the monthly magazines of this country and England, some of the weeklies, and occasional articles in the dailies; they all print very good matter. With wise management, I think a newspaper dealing with such subjects would have as much success in journalism as Green's English history had among historical works.

JOURNALIST.—But come to the point. What are the tendencies of journalism? How will the newspaper of the twentieth century differ from that of the nineteenth?

SIR O.—There are several factors which may come into play, the influence of which it is very difficult to determine. It looks to me as if the journal of the future will dispense with the compositor or typesetter. The artist will be employed as well as the writer; and their sketches and text will be photographs put on gelatine, or some similar menstruum, and multiplied *ad infinitum*. This would revolutionize the whole art of printing, and would appeal to the artistic taste of the community. Our newspapers to-day are hideous libels upon typographical art; they are an offence to the eye and good taste generally. I try not to indulge in utopias; yet I cannot but believe that the average Sunday paper of the year 1888 will be looked upon twenty-five years from now as something monstrous,—inconceivable. Then who knows but what the graphophone may take the place of much of our

permanent and transient literature. There is a conceit in Bellamy's "Looking Backward," which may become a reality. In the year 2000, he says, it will not be necessary to go to a meeting to hear a political orator, or to a church to be edified by a fine discourse, or to a concert hall to hear the noblest instrumental or vocal music. The telephone and the graphophone will be so perfected that we can enjoy these pleasures at our own homes. Now there may be something in this. Who knows but what newspaper judgments may be set aside by the ability of every citizen to get into direct communication with original sources of information. Suppose, for instance, the Chicago Anarchists, before they died, could have told their side of the story to the public directly through the telephone, might it not have made some difference in public judgment? Grand-Master Powderly, Brotherhood of Engineers' Arthur, Henry George, or Father McGlynn, at present have no show with the public, because newspaper proprietors are violently prejudiced against them, and will not give their side of the story: but suppose there was some means for a curious and impartial public to get these men's own statements.

JOURNALIST.—This is all hypothetical. Tell us briefly what you expect within the next twenty-five years in the way of changes in our periodical press.

SIR O.—I believe that illustrated papers daily and weekly will abound. Daily papers will decrease in numbers, but improve in tone. But in the weekly and monthly publications all tastes and interests will be appealed to. I presume that the sensational paper then as now would have the largest circulation; but the moderate and sensible, the widest influence. The moral tone of the journals of that day will correspond to the educa-

tion and refinement of the mass of daily readers I hope for the best; but I see nothing to warrant me in believing that the American of the twentieth century will differ very greatly from the American of the nineteenth century. Wealth and luxury is increasing, and will be accompanied by a certain amount of demoralization.

JOURNALIST.—In view of the enormous mass of books and periodicals published will not some machinery be adopted to instruct people in what to read?

SIR O.—There are agencies of that kind at work now. Every college instructs its graduates as to what is the best literature. Here is a process of natural selection going on which is burying bad and weak books out of sight. All journalistic work is necessarily ephemeral. The most brilliant writer of current topics lives but for a day.

JOURNALIST.—Let me close this conversation with a prediction. The Jew will, I think, cut in the future a larger figure in American journalism than he has in the past. The bulk of the Continental press is openly or secretly under the control of Jews. The most widely circulated journal in London, the *Telegraph*, is owned by a member of that race; and the same is true of the most popular paper in New York City. But Mr. Joseph Pulitzer is, I believe, the only Hebrew owning an American newspaper just now. The Jew knows how to cater to the minor wants of mankind. He is the most expert of peddlers, and the most successful of merchants. His abilities and his moral defects are just what are most likely to find their full play in American journalism.

A BODY OF CENSORS PROPOSED.

THEORIST.—Is it not a defect in our institutions that there is no organ for calling the attention of our people to their own deficiencies? The politicians flatter the people, the business of the Fourth of July orators is to set forth the glory and strength of the country and the superiority of our institutions over those of other nations. The press ought to hold the mirror up to nature and be the censor of public morals. But newspapers are business enterprises, and the aim of editor and publisher is to cater to popular passions and prejudices and not correct public evils.

SIR ORACLE.—I have long believed that we ought to have had in this country a body of men and women known as censors. They should devote themselves to the unpopular task of showing up whatever evil influences there were in our institutions with a view to their correction. They should have their representatives in every legislative body—local, State, and national. But their business would be to report and recommend what action should be taken by the body of the voters. They themselves should give up all hope of holding places of power or profit.

THEORIST.—There are traces of some such institutions in many countries. The prophets under the Jewish régime were critics, and very stern ones, of the shortcomings,

both of princes and the people. There are public censors in China to-day, but they often degenerate into mere spies, as their reports are made, not to the public, but to the ruling powers. One of the vaguest chapters in Roman history is that which relates to the censors, who, during one period of the republic, were very powerful. In periods of corruption they were authorized to revise the polling list, and they often disfranchised large masses of voters. They could declare that certain candidates were unworthy of holding high office. The censors themselves sometimes became rulers in Rome. The Appian Way was built by and named after a famous censor. But the rise and fall of that useful institution is shrouded in mystery.

SIR O.—It would be a great benefit to our country if there was an organization of voluntary censors in every large city. The press claims to represent public opinion on all the great questions of the day, and to be on the side of right as against wrong. But the business interests of the journals often array them on the side of corruption and popular prejudice. Take the monstrous abuses of our pension systems. The politicians dare not call their souls their own in face of the soldier vote. The press declines to represent the public conscience in this matter, and has no word of rebuke for the $80,000,000 spent in pensions annually more than a quarter of a century after the civil war closed. The newspaper editors know of course that fully $60,000,000 of this vast sum is a pure steal. But while they will yelp like curs at a few thousands in a doubtful appropriation for an indispensable river and harbor bill, they say nothing about the hideous waste of these pension bills.

THEORIST.—A body of voluntary censors, such as you

propose, would be very unpopular,—that is, if they did their duty and told the truth about public men and public measures. Then what guaranty would there be that they would be always right in their criticisms and strictures?

SIR O.—Of course they would be wrong at times; but if they entered upon their work with a pledge that they would never hold office of profit personally, they would give a guaranty of disinterested conduct. They themselves would be so sharply criticised by the powerful interests they would assail, that they would be forced to be prudent and lean on the side of justice.

THEORIST.—But would it be feasible to organize such a body? Are there men and women in every community willing to sacrifice themselves for the good of the state?

SIR O.—Every free state that has appeared in history has developed men and women willing to sacrifice their own ease, and even life, for the public good. Men who died on the battle-field were often inspired by pure love of country. The case of the Abolitionists and other reformers shows that certain people are always ready to become martyrs so that humanity may be served. I think if it was clearly shown that a body of censors, such as I have designated, would be useful to the public, there would not be wanting plenty of volunteers to help correct the great public evils.

THEORIST.—What national obliquities and shortcomings have you particularly in mind which need correction and abatement?

SIR O.—To begin with, we are a vainglorious people, and to correct this defect, we need frequent reminders of our shortcomings. Take our system of popular education, for instance; we are far in the rear of

Germany or Switzerland, and in the present rate of retrogression Great Britain and France will be ahead of us in time. Yet it is not many years since our public-school system was the best in the world. Then our legal machinery is in a deplorable condition ; we have more law and probably less justice than any other modern civilized nation. Our political methods are exceedingly defective. We elect a Congress in one year which does not commence to legislate for a year and a half afterwards, and this in an age of steam and electricity. An English Parliament assembles immediately after a general election, and hence responds to the public opinion of its day. Then the frequent Parliamentary elections in England serve to inform the Cabinet as to the drift of opinion in the political constituencies. The permanently hostile attitude of our press towards the laboring classes is a very serious matter, and may sometime result in a catastrophe. Then the censors could canvass our list of candidates at every election, and warn voters against the black sheep. It is now impossible for us to tell the unworthy from the worthy we vote for on the several tickets. But it would take a book to cover this ground. It is very certain that the press does not fulfil its mission, except in a very inadequate way, as a censor of public morals or a corrector of popular delusions. If a new Christ was to be sacrificed, so eager is the press to represent the passions of the hour, that it would be unanimous in demanding his crucifixion. I confidently predict that somehow or other there will arise a body of men and women who will do for us what the censors did for Rome, and the prophets for the people of Israel.

THE FATE OF THE NEGRO.

MR. NEWLIGHT.—I recently read Froude's "West Indies," Sir Oracle, and it struck me that there are some lessons to be drawn from it which you might set forth in these conversations.

SIR ORACLE.—I am willing to consider any subject, but must decline to commit myself to any views which are suggested to your mind. Suppose you go ahead and take the lead in the conversation.

MR. N.—Very good. I propose to give utterance to opinions which may be new to your readers, but which I think are justified by the past history of mankind. I am one of those who never have believed in the equality of mankind, or in the general theory of human rights which underlies the Declaration of Independence. I am of the opinion that the doctrine of evolution throws a light upon this question of human progress which discredits not only the theological but the rationalistic theories which have been held heretofore.

SIR O.—I am afraid this is too large a subject to be considered in a conversation. You can only take it up in sections. Suppose we consider only the future of the negro race. Indeed, as I remember, that is the topic emphasized by Froude's visit to the West India Islands.

MR. N.—In considering that phase of the question we must subordinate the whole discussion to some general

theory. Now the doctrine of human rights applied to the whole human family does not work. Free institutions are only fitted for the Caucasian race, and have not as yet proved workable, except among the English-speaking races.

SIR O.—Yes; I think I see the drift of your thought. Liberty will do for Englishmen and Americans. The negro to-day is the same as he was at the time of Sesostris. He makes no progress except under the tutelage of the white. Left to himself he sinks back into barbarism, as witness Hayti.

MR. N.—Yes; that is my line of argument. Froude shows that the West Indies are becoming barbarized; that any change which permits the blacks to dominate over the whites will end in the destruction of all civilization. In their native country the blacks organize witch hunts and deliberately kill the more intelligent members of the tribe; hence there is a premium on mediocrity and savagery.

SIR O.—These discussions are interesting in view of the fact that the Dark Continent is about being opened up. The next fifty years will see a mighty change in that ancient and most backward section of the earth. Gold is being discovered in many parts of the continent. Railroads are being pushed toward the Congo region, and in a very few years the white man will dominate in regions now controlled by colored potentates. It is a pity some well-defined plan is not agreed upon by the leading nations to govern their future relations with the colored races of Africa.

MR. N.—So far, of course, we have been poisoning these poor colored people with whiskey and scattering foul diseases throughout the continent. This will thin

off their numbers. Christianity makes no real progress in Africa. According to Canon Taylor and the Rev. Mr. Johnstone of the Church of England, the one reforming religious influence in Africa is the spread of Islamism. Mohammedanism seems to be better adapted to the calibre of the negro brain than Christianity. Then it is more moralizing, for every Moslem church is a total-abstinence society; while rum and Christianity accompany each other wherever traders and missionaries can get a foothold among uncivilized races. Of course, this is repugnant to the great body of Christian people, but their governments, nevertheless, play into the hands of the conscienceless traders.

SIR O.—These same writers you mention, while they doubt the possibility of progress by the pure negro, say there are two crosses which produce fairly good results. One gives us the Zulus of South Africa; the other is the cross between the Arab and the African, which produces a warlike and rather a superior race.

MR. N.—All these questions ought to be submitted to a congress of experts—to scientific men, in other words,—and they should give the result of their conferences for the guidance of the leading nations. It is a scandal to our civilization and Christianity that we should insist upon forcing opium and strong drink upon the semi-civilized nations as well as the savages. Then there ought to be some agreement for organizing a system that will compel the savages of Africa to do some regular work. They are now idle and of their own accord will never be induced to labor continuously. Africa will never be redeemed, except in two ways: either the natives must be forced to work, or they must be killed off to give place for the races who will work. This exter-

minating process, by the way, is the one in vogue among the English-speaking races, as witness the Red Indians of this continent, the Australian and Maori, as well as the aborigines of South Africa.

SIR O.—Do you know what you are saying? You are advocating the reëstablishment of slavery. Would that not be a step backward in the civilization of the age?

MR. N.—I am advocating going forward instead of backward. Slavery in the past was a vast benefit to mankind. It was the gate through which the foremost races passed in order to reach higher levels of civilization. In slavery human beings learned how to work continuously for the benefit of others. Incidental to slavery were many and grievous evils, but some day civilization will again protect weak people from themselves by forcing them to work, so that their labor may be utilized for their own benefit as well as for the community. We shall probably never again see personal slavery—that is, no one person will ever be the bondman or bondwoman of any person or family. But I judge that the time is coming when those that cannot take care of themselves, who are in constant danger of starvation, who are irredeemable drunkards or opium-eaters, will be forced to accept the mastership of officers appointed by the community. They will be made to work, but will be insured not only against starvation, but suffering of any kind. It is a shame to the community that so many millions are always on the verge of starvation. The condition of the poor, even in most civilized nations, is a crime against humanity.

SIR O.—Those problems will come up for settlement in the Old World before they will disturb us here. I do not see how we can set to work to reëstablish a modified

system of slavery, in view of the traditions of our history. But I agree with you that the future of the negro race in the West India Islands is likely to lead to serious complications in the future. Naturally Cuba, Jamaica, and Hayti ought, in the fulness of time, to belong to the United States. But our people will not be willing to hand them over to the tender mercies of the degraded colored people in those islands. Universal suffrage is a farce when exercised by savages. Then we will not be willing to see England apply any system of coerced labor in its Western possessions. Now every thing is going to the dogs in those beautiful and fertile islands because of the progressive degradation of the free negroes. The recent news from Cuba is really appalling. The blacks have been emancipated, and they will do no more work. All the great estates on the island are going to waste. Taxation is increasing, and that most fertile of countries is no longer producing much of any thing for export, while the blacks are relapsing into barbarism. So far as industry and civilization are concerned, the emancipation of the slaves in the West India Islands has proved disastrous in every way.

MR. N.—I have small hopes of gaining any converts to my apparently retrograde views, but I rely upon the spread of scientific knowledge which will discredit the human-right theories first propounded by the eighteenth-century philosophers. Men are not born free; we live in a hard world, and the conditions throughout life are onerous. We must do the best we can; the object, of course, being the greatest good to the greatest number. This may involve exceptional hardships to a few. In a beehive, you know, the superfluous males are deliberately stung to death. The supreme object of regard is the

hive; it must be the first consideration, even as against the life of any of its members. So it will eventually be in human society. Every member of the great human hive must be subordinated to the community. This is true ground to take as against the Anarchists. For the sake of the individual they would destroy the hive, but the contrary doctrine is the true one. We are all cells in the great body of humanity, and we cannot all be equal or free; we must get our consolation in the knowledge that we are working for the great whole.

THE TENDENCIES OF EDUCATION.

EDUCATOR.—Might it not be a good idea to try and indicate the changes likely to occur in the education of the generation that is to follow us? Do you not think, Sir Oracle, that we shall eventually have universities which will give as good an education as can be secured in the best institutions of the Old World?

SIR ORACLE.—The question of education is a vast one and involves many ramifications. A very hopeful sign of the times is the willingness of our rich men to give of their abundance to promoting what they deem the highest forms of education. In the Middle Ages the wealthy gave of their abundance to the Church, so that the latter should have ample funds to advance the interest of Catholicism and incidentally to reform and educate the rulers of the people. This accounts for the Catholic Church owning such enormous landed possessions, of which it has since been stripped by nearly every modern nation, including the Catholic powers. But the modern rich man bestows his benefactions upon educational and charitable institutions. Yes, I think it is extremely probable that as good an education of a higher sort can be got in this country as abroad, but there are some drawbacks.

ED.—To what do you refer?

SIR O.—Frankly I think the clerical influence is altogether too powerful in our colleges and universities. Ex-

President White is quite correct in objecting to so many of our colleges furnishing sinecures to broken-down clergymen. Parents naturally want their sons and daughters to be under religious influence, and hence they tolerate the great number of "reverends" who are made presidents and professors, and have nothing to recommend them but their clerical profession. They are generally bad business men, and their attitude toward modern science is antagonistic. Curiously enough the institutions in the Old World are far more free from mediæval religious mysticism than are those of our own country. What is known as advanced scientific thought has very little show in any of our colleges, even in Harvard. The professional chairs represent the creeds of the past, not the living and advanced thought of the present. It may not be generally known, but at Harvard the philosophy taught the pupils by the most popular professors is Hegelianism, which has been discredited in the country of its birth for the past fifty years. The political economy inculcated in the same institution is that of the Manchester school, which is thirty years behind the age. Yale, Princeton, and Columbia are no better than Harvard.

ED.—Surely there are some institutions which give modern thought more consideration.

SIR O.—Yes, the Johns Hopkins University is doing excellent work. It is turning out hosts of graduate students who are fully abreast of the times, especially in sociology and political economy. Cornell and the University of Michigan are also doing good work.

ED.—Is there no way of enlightening the public as to the merits or demerits of our leading institutions?

SIR O.—There is no authoritative criticism of our vari-

ous collegiate institutions. England has had the benefit of exhaustive inquiries into educational methods. Parliamentary commissions have thoroughly investigated not only the leading universities but the various public schools, as they are called, such as Eton, Harrow, Rugby, and Westminster. Then men of splendid educational training, such as Matthew Arnold, have been employed at large salaries by the government to inquire into the educational systems of France and Germany. We have no such machinery for forming a judgment of our colleges, and parents are without guides, except the reputation of colleges founded upon the distinguished graduates they turned out thirty or forty years ago.

ED.—What have you to say about female higher education?

SIR O.—I suppose that the graduates of our female colleges will compare favorably with any other class of women in the community. They will have more general information, better health, and will turn out good wives and mothers. But I do not think that we have got the best results from such institutions as Vassar, Smith, Wellesley, and Cornell. Vassar has been nearly a quarter of a century in existence, and, as far as I know, has not produced one distinguished woman. Where is a graduate of Vassar known as being eminent in art, science or literature? But I have no doubt that that institution has produced a great many well-bred, moral young women. Many of them have become teachers, and good ones; but if the girls originally had genius, their wings have been clipped by the course of study. It will be remembered that the officers of Vassar have generally been Baptist clergymen of no great note among their own denomination. Wellesley may do better work, but the officers are

mostly women. I look for best work in colleges where the two sexes are trained together.

ED.—What salient feature strikes you in connection with our American education?

SIR O.—The fact that thirty years ago we were ahead of the world in our common-school system, whereas now we are far behind other civilized countries. The statistics of illiteracy shows that there are over sixteen per cent. of the American people who cannot read or write. The proportion of illiterates in Germany is less than two per cent. Then technical education is far in the rear in this country compared with the Continental nations. The most artistic designers and skilful artisans in our shops and factories are generally Germans. The American mechanics are forced to work under the direction of these foreigners, because we have not provided them with a suitable education. Unfortunately our people are monstrously conceited and cannot be made to understand that they are being beaten in the race for artistic and industrial supremacy.

ED.—What suggestions would you make looking towards a reform in our educational method?

SIR O.—That is rather a large question to answer off-hand, for it would require a volume to go over the ground thoroughly. Perhaps, however, I may venture to suggest a few points: (1) Greater attention to technical education; every boy and girl in our public schools should be trained so that they could earn their living by some handicraft. (2) The passage of the Blair or some similar bill, so that the general government would make good any deficiencies in the State educational systems. (3) The appointment of commissions to investigate every leading educational institution in the country and report

to the public. (4) Putting a stop to the abuse of quartering broken-down clergymen upon colleges to furnish them a living. (5) The establishment of a great national university on the programme put forth by ex-President White, of Cornell. (6) Some means of letting rich men know in what way their benefactions would be of most value in advancing the cause of higher education, both of men and women. And, finally, I would have incorporated in every State Constitution a provision ordering every Legislature to give the best possible education to every boy and girl born in the State. Education should be something more than learning the three *R*'s. It should involve a knowledge of every thing that would fit them for the work of life.

NEW YORK AS IT WILL BE.

REALTY OWNER.—Why not give us your impressions of the next twenty years? What changes are likely to occur in that time in our local history?

SIR ORACLE.—That perhaps is a natural question to ask of me, but it is difficult to say any thing that would seem original. I have been over the ground quite often, but perhaps it would be well to keep a few salient possibilities in mind.

R. O.—Do you think that the population of New York will increase as rapidly in the next quarter of a century as it has in the last twenty-five years? Are there not many points in the West where the ratio of increase will be larger?

SIR O.—There is every reason to believe that our population will keep up the same percentage of addition as in the past, but of course relatively there are larger increases of numbers in many different points of the West, on the Pacific coast, and even in the South. Kansas City, Wachita, Denver, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Los Angeles, San Diego, are among the places where the rate of increases is greater than here. In the fulness of time a mightier city than New York will be developed in the region west of the lakes. If the national capitol was at St. Louis, I should expect that city to become the largest—that is, the most populous and wealthy in the country;

for, as has been often pointed out, the great centres of population of the world are not made so by commerce or manufactures, but they become great from being the seats of power. It is monarchs and courts and parliaments which draw vast throngs of people to certain places. Look at the map of the world: the great cities—London, Paris, Berlin, Madrid, Vienna, Moscow, Pekin, Yeddo—are all inland; they are or were the capitals of their several nations. Our Washington is an exception, because it is badly located. Without manufactures or commerce it has become a splendid city. New York is the only place which has become important, because of its situation, and without having the advantage of Congress or court to give it preëminence.

R. O.—Well, let us come to the point. Although not the seat of the central power, do you still think New York will keep its present prominence during the next quarter of a century?

Sir O.—Yes; I think during the next decade it will increase in about the same ratio as during the last decade. Thus in twenty years our population ought to be over two millions and a half. But I am further of the impression that before many years are over, Brooklyn and the surrounding towns will form an integral part of the metropolis. Indeed I should not be surprised if all the population surrounding New York Bay, including the Jersey shore, was made into a State of the Union. Our interests here are not those of the central and western parts of the State, and I foresee a fierce antagonism in the future between this port and Albany. New York has only two Senators, while its population is larger than eight other States that could be named. We have precedents in the case of Massachusetts and Virginia, form-

ing new States out of old ones. Maine was once a part of the Bay State and West Virginia of Virginia proper. Texas is destined to be cut up into four or five States. California is too large ; so is Dakota.

R. O.—Will New York become more or less thickly populated in the future? Will not the numerous railroads connecting us with the suburbs extend our territory for occupancy at the expense of the density of population.

SIR O.—At first sight it would seem as if the new facilities for getting into the country would scatter our population and give us fewer residents to the square mile, but, curiously enough, this has not proved true in the past. It was after the elevated roads were running that the demand for great office buildings and apartment houses set in. We had the three-story brick house in our early history. The four-story brown-stone era came in with the horse-cars. Had there been no means of getting up-town more rapidly, the great exchanges would have been forced to change their location to Madison Square or above. But the elevated roads have concentrated business in the lower part of the city, and it will stay there for another century. I expect to see the ground below City Hall Park covered with enormously high houses, and probably ten times as many people will do business there as to-day.

R. O.—In that case the throngs would be so great as to make the streets down-town impassable.

SIR O. That will be true if facilities are not afforded for the surplus travel in underground roads. There will be a sub-city under the surface of the ground for conveying people, not only from the Battery to the City Hall Park, but also from the East to the North River. Then

I expect to to see aërial paths connecting the various tall buildings that have elevators one with the other. People who wish to pass, say from the Mills Building in Broad street to the Boreel Building in Broadway, will be able to do so over a wind-guarded passageway or bridge running over the tops of the houses.

R. O.—You look for increased facilities in getting from one part of the city to the other, and also to the suburbs?

SIR O.—New York is admirably situated for transportation purposes. People will want to do business here because of the economy of time in getting from one business centre to another. Street cars in the near future will only be used for short distances, and will in time be changed to cable roads. We will have swift transit from the Battery to the Harlem River, and branches will be built to connect the ferries with the Central rapid-transit steam road. Persons who read these lines will see the day when they can travel from the Battery to Harlem in twenty minutes, and can reach any part of the island from any other part in thirty minutes. A tunnel is underway from Jersey City to New York. At least three will be built under the East River between New York and Brooklyn. The plans for a second bridge over the East River and Blackwell's Island are already prepared, and the close of this century will probably see the construction of a bridge over the Hudson between Washington Heights and Fort Lee. Later there will be one from Hoboken to the central zone of the island. Twenty years will see our water front vastly improved by the construction of a magnificent dock system, the work on which is now being prosecuted. Then there is the Harlem Canal improvement that will effect a mighty change in

the future of the metropolis. It will give us ten more miles of docks and piers in which to transact the immense business yet to be done on either side of the Harlem River. Here will be situated some of our largest markets and great depots for coal, lumber, and other building materials. In time the railroads will discharge their freight into foreign-bound steamers at Port Morris, hence a great warehouse system will grow up on the Sound and river fronts adjacent to what was once Hell Gate. While I think the exchanges will remain in the lower part of the city, I look for the great commercial centre to grow up on the northeast side of this island and on the opposite shore beyond the Harlem.

R. O.—How about our street and sanitary arrangements? When the population becomes dense, will the health of the city become better or worse?

SIR O.—I think the average length of life will be very much increased within the coming twenty years; but we must reconstruct our sewers, so that they can be flushed every twenty-four hours by the tides of the East and North rivers. Then provision must be made for gas and water pipes, as in the sewers of Paris, which are large enough to accommodate an army. There is a law in our statute books appropriating $1,000,000 yearly for constructing small parks in the more densely settled and poorer districts. This will rid us in time of the worst plague spots in the tenement regions. Our building laws and Health Board no longer permit the construction of unwholesome tenements. New York is destined to be a greater warehouse centre. Its importance as a place of business is growing, and this will relatively lessen the number of people living on this island. There will be a vast population in the region beyond the Harlem, which

will have the rare advantage of a wisely planned system of rapid transit. The people who live in this region will extol the memories of John Mullaly, and the gentlemen associated with him, who projected the splendid system of parks and parkways, which will in twenty years be regarded as one of the glories of the metropolis. The residential New York of the future will extend from 57th Street up to Putnam County on the north, and to the Connecticut State line on the northeast.

R. O.—All this is obvious enough. How about the government of the city? Will the "Boodle" aldermen thrive and flourish during the coming twenty years?

SIR O.—I really hope we will have better government in the future. Communities go through three experiences in this country, At the beginning, when they are small and every one knows his neighbor, local government is honest and efficient. The most perfect and purest democratic government the world ever saw was that of a New England town-meeting. But when trade centres become very populous, the average citizen cares more for his business than politics, and the town-meeting system becomes inadequate. Then the wire-puller and the "boss" makes his appearance, which results finally in Tweed rings and "Boodle" aldermen. But when cities become really great, a spirit of civic pride is generated, and the better classes again come to the front. It is noticed that the larger the locality the better the class of elected public officers. It is the small district in point of numbers which chooses the poorest representatives. Our mayors have generally been honest and able men, and in the long list of them there are only a few who are black sheep, while our aldermen have nearly always been corrupt. Were Brooklyn joined to New York, and the

mayor and heads of departments given authority and responsibility, I believe we would choose first-class rulers —men after the type of Abram S. Hewitt and Seth Low. The citizens of a really big city would never deliberately choose fools or rascals for their chief executive officers.

WHAT SCIENCE HAS IN STORE FOR US.

MR. NEWNOTION.—We had a severe winter last year, Sir Oracle. Do you think that man will ever be able to control the weather, as well as to foretell it? Will he ever obtain such command over the forces of nature as to be able to subdue the rigors of winter and modify the heats of summer?

SIR ORACLE.—Man does this in a measure to-day by his clothing, and the use of artificial heat. He has also invented ice-making machines, and proved the possibility of cooling houses, halls, and theatres during the heated terms in summer.

MR. N.—We understand that, of course; but I am of the impression that the race will eventually be able to put a stop to blizzards, and to keep the temperature always above zero, while not permitting it to rise as high as 90° in the summer-time. It would require a treatise to explain how this might be done, but I believe in the generations to come the earth in all its parts and in all its seasons will permit of man living in it with comparative comfort, so far as the variation of the weather is concerned. Then we know that inundations and droughts can be provided against by the growth of forests in the right places.

SIR O.—It is rather a draft on our credulity to believe that man can modify the different temperatures of

all parts of the earth. But I do not see why the more favored of the sons of men may not sometime or other live under conditions that would save them from the bitter blasts of winter and the torrid heats of summer. Writers have often shown how possible it is to have sanitariums, consisting of an inclosure of fifty to a hundred acres covered by glass with a framework of iron. Within this inclosure could be found the temperatures and the other peculiarities of the noted health resorts of the world, such as Nice, Mentone, Florida, Colorado, and Southern California. I believe in time that children will be born and live to an old age without ever having occasion to breathe the outside air, or to be exposed to the inclemency of the weather as it is in nature. Man is forced to live an artificial life. He wears clothes, he dwells in houses, he eats cooked food; but so far he has had to take his air and his water raw, and more than half the acute diseases of mankind result from the use of air and water as we find them in nature. They must be manipulated and made wholesome. We cannot afford to drink in or inhale germs of disease or malarial poisons.

MR. N.—But those who live under glass cannot very well cultivate the earth in any large way. I am in hopes, however, that science will in time give us cheap food products. I see that chemistry now furnishes us with an alkaloid which is even better than quinine as a drug. It is no longer necessary to grow madder or indigo, for substances that replace them can be produced artificially and far more cheaply. A sugar has been produced from the residuum of coal-tar with three hundred and twenty times more sweetening power than the ordinary sugar-cane. As yet it is very dear, but there is no reason why we should not in time dispense with the labor bestowed

upon the sugar-cane and sorghum. See what a large portion of the earth's surface could then be put to other uses. Some chemists are of the opinion that tea, alcohol, most of the drugs, and dye-stuffs will in a short time be produced from inorganic materials. We are entering upon an era of synthetic chemistry—that is, scientific men form new combinations of the various chemical elements, and the most surprising and important results are thereby rendered possible. Every day almost we hear of a new explosive, another anæsthetic, or the production of what was formerly regarded as organic material out of the inorganic world. It is from this source that we must look for the abolition of poverty. Science will give us all we require to live on this earth in great abundance and at a mere trifle of cost. The globe will then be able to support in comfort fifty billion of people instead of the 1,300,000,000 now supposed to be on its surface, the vast bulk of whom are on the verge of starvation.

SIR O.—It is hard to put any limitations to what man may do in the way of inventions and new discoveries. He is undoubtedly the god of this planet, and he will in time dominate the entire surface of the globe. Aëriel navigation will solve the mystery of the poles, and eventually there will be no "dark region" on any of the continents. Waste places will be reclaimed, deserts made productive by irrigation, forests regrown where needed, and waters dyked out in districts where the same conditions obtain as in Holland. These changes will modify the rigors of the various climates of the world.

MR. N.—Would not a wide canal cutting off the arctic regions, from the continents of Asia and North America, do much to save us from very cold weather and perhaps blizzards?

SIR O.—It is quite true that Europe, South America, and Africa owe much of their immunity from severe cold to the oceans that separate them from the polar regions, but it seems preposterous to hope that man can create the same watery barriers by artificial means.

MR. N.—Yet it seems there are artificial canals, eighty to one hundred miles wide, on the planet Mars. Why may we not discover an explosive so powerful that mountain ranges may be torn down, and vast waterways, such as those of Mars, reproduced on this earth?

SIR O.—There is no certainty that the apparent waterways on Mars are canals at all, and we must not expect too much of man's inventive genius. Man will undoubtedly make this earth a pleasanter place to live in, and he will also people it with a superior race that will enjoy it more than we do. The two things worth living for are the improvement of man and the perfection of his environment.

MR. N.—It seems to me that man will some time be forced to remake the earth he lives on. I judge we have very little idea of the capabilities of the soil of our planet for improvement. I think it safe to predict that any given spot on the earth can, by proper manipulation of the soil, produce a hundred-fold more than it does under the system of agriculture now prevailing.

SIR O.—I have read Prince Krapotkin's statement of what has been done with the soil near Paris. Then there is Mr. Cole's scheme of what I think he calls "subaqueous culture." That is, he utilizes the rivers, and streams, and wells to keep the soil constantly moist. It costs some four to five hundred dollars an acre, but it makes the land for agricultural purposes worth literally thousands of dollars an acre.

MR. N.—I know nothing of the researches of the

Prince or the experiments of Mr. Cole; but for twenty years at least I have been satisfied that man would reconstruct the soil from which he extracts his sustenance. We know that in some places there is too much clay, in others too much sand. I do not see why, with our railroad system, we cannot bring the clay to the sand, and *vice versa*. We know what marvels have been wrought in the past by irrigation. Now, I believe this system of treating the soil will be as valuable in rainy as in rainless regions of the earth. With proper systems of drains and reservoirs, no part of the soil need be too dry or too wet. It is estimated, I believe, that there are now 1,300,000,000 people on the surface of the globe. It may seem wild, but I think that this earth in time will support in comfort 50,000,000,000 of people.

SIR O.—Well, that does seem extravagant. You do not agree with Malthus, then, that the earth can become over-populated, and that wars, pestilences, and human vices are agencies not wholly bad, inasmuch as they keep down the human surplus?

MR. N.—While I most profoundly believe that man will obtain such control of land and sea as to multiply indefinitely the food supply, I nevertheless hold it to be equally true that we must in some way control the production of human beings. If ever society is dominated by the scientific spirit, children will not be born haphazard as they are now. Criminals, the insane, and the diseased will not be permitted to imperil future generations by bringing into the world undesirable and miserable offspring. We will breed from the best, not from the worst. How this is to be brought about I do not know, but the progress and victories of science in the inorganic world will appear trifling when the organized experience of the race includes the organic world.

TRAVELLING THROUGH THE AIR.

QUERIST.—I see that Captain Renard of the French Army claims to have solved the problem of aërial navigation—that is, he is able to guide a vessel through the air against the wind. This is a very suggestive fact, I think.

SIR ORACLE.—I really believe we are on the eve of an earnest effort by inventors and enterprising wealthy men to solve all the problems connected with aërial navigation. We live in an inventive and speculative era, and there is something about aërial navigation which appeals not only to the hope of gain, but to the imagination of mankind. Before the close of this century tens of millions of dollars and thousands of lives will be sacrificed so that the race can have as complete control of the air as it has of land and water in travelling from one point to another.

QUERIST.—But look at the very slow progress of ballooning. It is one hundred years since the Mongolfiers ascended by means of hot air. Since then thousands of balloons filled with hydrogen gas have been sent up, but their great bulk and lightness made them the sport of the air currents. Scarcely any progress was made up to the time Captain Renard made use of the electric accumulator invented by Faure and improved by Siemens.

SIR O.—That is true, but luckily the science and in-

vention of the age have solved so many problems in electricity that we are now in a position to use it to advantage as a motive power, not only on land and water, but through the air. The days of steam as a motor seem to be numbered; electricity or some other force is destined to take its place.

QUERIST.—But will gas be used in the air-ships of the future? Birds and insects get through the atmosphere in twelve different ways without using gas at all; sometimes by the aid of powerful wings, such as those of the eagle, the vulture, or the hawk; at other times by a thin extended membrane, such as that of the butterfly and numerous insects. Must man utilize something different from any thing in nature and use a gas as well as a motor unknown to the birds which travel through the air?

SIR O.—It would seem so. Man's methods are not always those of nature. I am inclined to believe that the perfected air-ship will not need to use gas. It has long been predicted that whenever a motorial power could be created that would overcome the weight of the machinery that generated it, then the problem of aërial navigation was solved. If a steam-engine could raise a machine containing a man, and—engine, machine, and man—not weighing over three hundred pounds, why all difficulty was at an end. But, unfortunately, boilers, engines, and coal are so weighty that you cannot produce power enough to overcome their gravity. But the electric accumulator does not need coal, and generates great power compared with its weight. Its prime defect is its inability to create new power, hence the Renard machine can stay in the air but four hours, the accumulators then having to be recharged with electricity.

QUERIST.—You think, then, that wiser inventors will

confine their investigations to the motive power rather than to the shape of the balloon or the making it buoyant with gas?

SIR O.—Yes, though I think it likely for the time gas will be found useful. I have supposed that a metal like aluminum, for instance, would replace silk. Aluminum is very light, inoxidizable, and no gas could escape from it. With this metal, the machine could not be easily injured, and it could stand hard knocks.

QUERIST.—But the point is not how balloons are to be made or what the motive power is to be, but what marked changes will be effected by aërial navigation. Will not the air-ships be a standing bear argument against railway stock?

SIR O.—The present generation of speculators will, I judge, have passed away before the passenger air-vessel is able to compete with the Pullman car, and yet I have no doubt we shall in our own day see prodigious efforts made to perfect machines for getting through the air. It may be the gigantic speculation of the close of this century. See what millions of capital have been created to handle the telegraph, the telephone, and the electric light. But for every dollar of stock created by these three inventions, you will see a thousand put into the capital of companies that will aim at navigating the atmosphere.

QUERIST.—You seem to dwell upon this point.

SIR O.—Yes, because it is the only obvious one. It is what will most interest wealthy and enterprising people. He who owns stock in an aërial company based on a patent for a successful machine will be in luck. I hardly like to speculate upon the changes which aërial navigation will bring about in the travel and business of the world. It is curious to notice that in Europe the

chief interest is in army and navy circles. It is the use that can be made of air vessels to destroy cities, inspect hostile camps and fortresses, and throw destructive missiles into an enemy's ship of war. Captain Renard declares that he can construct a machine which will convey a hundred soldiers through the air. Perhaps aërial science may be benefited by organized bureaus, such as that of the army and navy departments, conducting the first experiments. But clearly the larger use of the air-ship will not be for war and destruction, but for man's happiness and convenience. It will make all parts of the earth accessible to him. There will be no "dark continents" when air-ships abound, and the mystery not only of the North but of the South Pole will be solved just as soon as it is possible to travel a thousand miles through the atmosphere. Of course one change will be in the spread of population. As it is easier to fly from hill-top to hill-top than from valley to valley, the latter will lose in population, and the former gain. If the aërostat should become as cheap for travellers as the sailing vessel, why may not man become migratory, like the birds, occupying the more mountainous regions and sea-coast in summer and more tropical climes in winter. Of course all this seems very wild, but we live in an age of scientific marvels, and the navigation of the air, if accomplished, would be the most momentous event of all the ages. It will do more to change human conditions than any invention in the past. The use of fire, of iron; the invention of gunpowder and of printing; the discovery of America,—all these are landmarks in the history of man, but what are they to the navigation of the air? I am not, I think, expecting too much. I do not see how heavy freight can ever be carried through

the atmosphere, but passengers certainly will; but I do not expect that this will be a cheap means of transit. Most of our inventions are costly. The tallow candle is the cheapest form of light; whale oil was an improvement for illuminating purposes. Kerosene, gas, the electric light were better illuminants in the order named, but they were also dearer in the same order. Walking is cheaper than sailing at sea; that costs less than horse-power, horse-power less than steam-power, and the electric motor, while it gives promise of better results, will, in all probability, be the dearest kind of locomotion. People who take air-ships will for many years find it a costly luxury. But it will serve to cheapen other forms of transit.

THE UTILIZATION OF DREAMS.

MR. FANCIFUL.—Why should not dreams be manipulated; or, in other words, may it not be possible to stimulate the nerve-centres of man so as to induce during sleep pleasurable dreams or visions?

SIR ORACLE.—That seems rather a fanciful idea, and I am afraid our readers will hardly think the topic worth discussing. Explain yourself.

MR. F.—As this is rather a hobby of mine, I hope our readers will try and follow my thought. I have been talking and writing about this matter for twenty years without having any response. Still, I am like a mother with a deformed child. I lay more store on this dream hobby of mine than on any other offspring of my brain.

SIR O.—Well, proceed. How do you expect to control dreams?

MR. F.—It will be conceded that the visions of the night are due to certain physical conditions of our body. If I eat a late supper, partaking of lobster salad or terrapin stew, the chances are that when I go to bed, if I lie on my back, I shall have a nightmare. Certainly I shall have troubled dreams. On the other hand, if I allow a good interval between my supper and my sleep, I shall have pleasant dreams, if I have any at all, especially if I have spent the evening without any bodily strain or mental excitement.

SIR O.—What you say is true enough. Moreover, it is a fact beyond dispute that our dreams are influenced by the stimulants and narcotics we may have taken during the evening.

MR. F.—I was coming to that. I think it will be found that our nightly visions are colored, if I may use that term, by the intoxicants or narcotics we have imbibed before going to bed. Your drinker of ale or porter will not have the same visions as the partaker of champagne. Then the stronger liquors, such as whiskey and brandy, will excite our dream-producing machinery in still another way. Of course, it often happens that these alcoholic drinks produce a kind of stupor in which there are no dreams, or, at least, none that we recall in our waking hours.

SIR O.—I was going to say that in all probability the brain is constantly active during sleep, and the dreams that we recall when awake are not a hundredth part of the visions which float through our minds during the still watches of the night. We know that during slumber all our bodily functions continue. The liver and kidneys secrete, the blood circulates, our lungs inhale and exhale. The brain alone seems to be under a cloud—in a state of oblivion, as it were.

MR. F.—That is why I call my conceit the utilization of sleep. Why should we pass one third of our life in this mock death. Would I not be a great benefactor to the race if I could make sleep conscious and pleasurable, so that the mind of man, which is now as it were under a cloud of thick darkness on an average eight hours in twenty-four, might become pleasurably conscious of itself?

SIR O.—You recall Tom Moore's lines; I quote from memory:

"It 's never too late for delight, my dear;
For the best of all ways
To lengthen your days
Is to steal a few hours from the night, my dear."

MR. F.—I do not mean this as a joke. I am in dead earnest. I deny, or at least doubt, the probability of personal immortality. But if my theory is of any value, science can give to man æons of pleasurable existence as a compensation.

SIR O.—Well, that is an astounding claim. Explain yourself.

MR. F.—So far, in my argument, I have tried to prove that our dreams are subjected to physical conditions largely controllable by man himself. Now let us consider the lessons taught us by the use of opium, Indian hemp, and other narcotics. These exercise a certain subtle influence on the nerves and brain which gives the human subject the most powerful visions. Read De Quincey's "Confessions of an Opium-Eater." He but tells the story of tens of thousands of persons who have formed the morphine or opium habit. In the East, especially in China, myriads of people have experienced the delights as well as the reactions which result from the use of opiates. This is a chapter in human history which has never been adequately treated by any recognized authority.

SIR O.—We know enough about opium to warn us to avoid it, lest we become a slave to a most degrading vice. It is true that De Quincey, the poet Coleridge, and others have been lifted into a seventh heaven of delight by using this mysterious drug, but the reaction has been as painful as the first effect was pleasurable. The opium-eater is one of the most unhappy of human beings. It

seems to be a law of nature that whatever unduly excites correspondingly depresses our nervous system.

MR. F.—I am not so sure about that. Take the example of oxygen-gas exhilaration. Here is a case in which there is no corresponding depression or exhaustion. We have all seen people under the influence of nitrous-oxide or laughing-gas. Properly used, no ill effects have followed the stimulation. Indeed, oxygen combined with nitrogen is just now very popular with physicians, who give it to stimulate wholesomely the waning strength of sick people. Up to date there have been some seventeen different anæsthetics discovered. Their effects on the human system vary. We know how valuable cocaine is and also how dangerous. Now my hope is that other compounds like laughing-gas will be discovered which will pleasantly stimulate our nervous system without being followed by any baneful reaction.

SIR O.—"May bees do not fly only one month of the year." Where do your countless æons of delight come in during the hours of sleep?

MR. F.—I hold that science has not yet been brought to bear upon man himself except in a partial way. Our organized human experience has been dealing with the inorganic world with wonderful results. Mathematics, astronomy, as well as other of the physical sciences, have received a great deal of attention from the race. Chemistry, it is said, dates from the discovery of oxygen gas by Priestley something over a century back; but biology, is yet in its infancy as a science. Further along in the history of the race, man himself and society will come under the domain of science.

SIR O.—Well! well! this is rather an old story. What has this got to do with dreams stretched over ages of time?

MR. F.—I have pointed out the possibility that compounds will be discovered which will have all the virtues and none of the defects of opium. And now for the statement of a curious fact which is not generally understood. Time and space have nothing to do with dreams. You know the contention of many philosophers that time and space are subjective conditions. They are the vestments, as it were, of our conscious life, and have no existence in reality. However this may be, it is a fact beyond all dispute that dreams are not bounded. Space and time do not control them. Instances are upon record when dreams seemed to occupy years, when really they had consumed only a few moments of absolute time. I could easily refer to instances, but it would prolong this conversation unnecessarily. You see all that is needed is to get the human body into the right conditions, apply the compound I said would yet be discovered, and the brain of the sleeping man would give birth to visions as magnificent, as varied, and as delightful as those which were experienced by the opium-stimulated brains of De Quincey and Coleridge. And they would last apparently for numberless years without any distressful physical or nervous reaction. The latest word in philosophy deprived us of any hope of a conscious life hereafter, but science may yet give us what may be called a subjective immortality every night we lay down to sleep. Such is my theory, Sir Oracle. It may be a dream in itself, but I would like to put it on record to be passed upon by the scientist of the year 2000.

SIR O.—It is curious you have not mentioned the word hypnotism or animal magnetism in connection with this matter. You are looking for some drug—an opiate

robbed of its horrors—to affect the nervous systems of men and women. May not a powerful personality be able to impress itself upon a sensitive subject, and induce these beatific visions which you think will occupy the sleeping hours of man in the future. A great deal that is done with hypnotic subjects is simply the inducing of dreams, of which the subjects are more or less conscious.

MR. F.—But I would not confine this to the so-called sensitives. So far the investigations go to show that only certain persons are susceptible, certainly not more than one in every seven adults. Still I do not think that scientists will be confined to any one or two drugs or any limited methods, in influencing the nervous sensibilities of that wonderful machine we call man. You have heard of the harp of a thousand strings ; but what is that to this marvellous integration of passions, sentiments, thoughts, and sensations which go to make up the whole round of human nature.

SIR O.—Well, you have started an interesting train of thoughts and have given a hint to the scientists to institute a series of experiments in an entirely new department of human nature.

SOME ODD CONCEITS.

MR. FANCIFUL.—What do you say to a conversation about weeds?

SIR ORACLE.—Are they worth discussing? Is it not our business to get rid of them by every means in our power?

MR. F.—I am not so sure of that. Some of our most valuable foods were once weeds, as witness wheat and nearly all the other cereals. The history of our fruits and of many of our kitchen-garden vegetables should make us tolerant at least of even noxious plants, large numbers of which have been cultivated—and shall I say humanized?—to fit them for the uses of the race. I do not think that people have emphasized sufficiently the fact that to man himself must be given the credit of having rescued from waste and chaos the plants which now nourish and sustain his life on this planet.

SIR O.—Well, go ahead. Explain yourself. What do you want to do with weeds?

MR. F.—Cultivate them.

SIR O.—I think I catch your meaning. If wheat and rye were once worthless weeds, if celery was originally a poisonous plant, you would like to see what would be the result were experiments to be instituted, developing the possibilities of the myriads of weeds and other apparently useless plants, which now are pests and hindrances to the agriculturist.

MR. F.—You have got my idea exactly. I am not a believer in final causes; and I do not argue that the Canadian thistle or the milk-weed was intended finally to be of value to the race. But we know that certain weeds such as the dandelion make good salads, and still others have a medicinal value; and it seems to me there ought to be some intelligent effort made to try and utilize all the plants which our earth so abundantly produces. If not valuable as food, they may have some use for clothing.

SIR O.—What have you to propose?

MR. F.—That some rich man or woman should make a large bequest for the deliberate cultivation of weeds. I am quite sure it would pay a hundred-fold in the discovery of valuable material now wasted.

SIR O.—I venture to say that, if any wealthy person made such a will and his disinherited relatives tested the matter in the courts, it would be set aside on the ground that the testator was a lunatic.

MR. F.—Well! let us change the subject. I have another lunacy, if you may call it such, respecting the novel or the romance of the future. Up to date, the Scotts, George Eliots, Stevensons, and Haggards have been forced to describe scenes, persons, and their peculiarities by words. True, pictures have been occasionally used to illustrate the author's text; but why should not modern art and invention go a great deal further. Let us take the case of a novel now exciting a good deal of interest—"Robert Elsmere." It opens with a two-page description of rural scenery in the north of England. Now I confess words rarely give me an idea of natural scenery. Suppose the work should have begun with the picture of a landscape. Then any person with eyes could

get a vivid impression of the villas, valleys, streams, foliage, and habitations in a given region.

SIR O.—But softly, would not the element of color be lacking? Black and white convey only a relative idea of a beautiful scene. You still have to imagine the blue of the sky, the green of the grass, the brown sand, and the neutral tints of the water.

MR. F.—You seem to forget the marvels of chromolithography. It is now possible to put in twenty colors on one plate, and to give all the tints of nature with singular fidelity. True the chromo of to-day is looked upon as crude and inartistic; but I venture to predict that it will be so far perfected as to allow any well-to-do family to have art galleries of their own, in which will be found reproductions of all the great paintings of the ancient and modern world. The crowning glory of our age will be when the highest art is brought within the reach of the poorest purse.

SIR O.—This is a digression. Tell us more about your novel of the future.

MR. F.—As with the scenery, so with the characters of the works of fiction I am describing. Robert Elsmere, Catherine Langham, and the other individuals, would all be reproduced pictorially. This would dispense with a great deal of description, and much of the verbiage could be cut out. Then the reader's conception of the characters would necessarily be much more vivid. Nor is this all. Why should not a number of graphophones be made use of, giving the words of the various conversations in the tones they would naturally use. An author then would employ a number of men and women of various ages to personate his characters. They would be like the models of an artist.

SIR O.—It seems to me that in that case a novel or romance could best be given in a public hall, with a stereopticon for the scenes, characters, and action, and the graphophone to give voice to the conversations.

MR. F.—That would make a kind of drama of it, although without actual actors. It would be pictures and voices. And that reminds me, I do not see why the stereopticon is not more used in schools, instead of text-books, for giving children an idea of history, geography, and the habits, and scenery of distant countries and their inhabitants. Education should appeal more to the eye and to the imagination, and not depend so much on words.

SIR O.—Have you any other lunacies to ventilate in this conversation?

MR. F.—Yes, just one more. The electric light, for working purposes, will turn night into day. Buildings and public works can now be constructed as readily from 9 P.M. to 5 A.M. as during daylight. In view of this fact it seems to me absurd to ask laborers to toil during mid-day in the hot summer months. Why should they not do their work instead during the cooler hours of the nights? There are many occupations now carried on after dark, such as type-setting, presswork, horse-car driving, and the like. Policemen have to be on their beat; and then marketmen and milkmen must be astir long before daylight. How absurd it is for every one to work and play at the same hours. Why should not stores be open in the evening, like theatres. It would add to the gayety and brilliancy of the streets in our principal cities. Then these great emporiums of business need not open until 11 A.M. I believe that six hours a day is as much as any one should work, either with hand or brain. Then with the electric light I do not see why

photographers and dentists should not pursue their vocations when the bulk of people have leisure—that is, in the evening and at night.

SIR O.—But is it not a plain requirement of nature that we should rest at night and work during the day?

MR. F.—I do not believe that policemen, compositors, marketmen, milkmen, and others who work at night and sleep during the day are any less healthy or shorter-lived than those who follow trades which allow them to sleep at night and work during the daytime. Take the case of English Parliamentary statesmen: Palmerston, Disraeli, Lord John Russell, and Mr. Gladstone are among the instances of men who have lived long lives, and yet have turned night into day, so far as hard work was concerned. English statesmen eat a heavy dinner at 8 o'clock P.M., and make their most important speeches after midnight; yet as a rule they have been long-lived. Indeed with the electric light I think it possible even for agricultural laborers to work during the cool of the night, instead of under the burning rays of the mid-day sun. They might not be able to take in hay while the dew is falling, but they could plant and plow and hoe, as well as gather certain crops.

SIR. O.—There may be something in what you say, but it is not easy to change one's habits. I judge by the close of the twentieth century the bulk of the race will do their work during the daytime, take their pleasure in the evening, and do most of their sleeping at night.

Mr. F.—While we are on this subject of light, I want to sun still another theory of mine. I hold the literature of the future ought to be issued in the colors of nature. Our books, magazines, and newspapers are now printed in black ink on white paper. Now black is simply the

absence of all color, and white is properly the presence of all colors. We could not see in a black world. That pure white is destructive to the sense of sight, is shown by the presence of ophthalmic diseases in the snowy polar regions and in countries covered by deserts, open to the burning rays of the mid-day sun. The color that is most grateful to the human eyes is the blue of the sky, the green of the foliage, or the neutral tints of the water. Now the generations which have been using our printed literature are injuring the integrity of their sense of sight. Black ink on white paper is an unnatural combination; hence the use of spectacles, the prevalence of myopia, and other eye diseases, and the impaired sight of all students.

SIR O.—Well, what are you going to do about it? The printed literature of all countries is in these objectionable colors.

MR. F.—That is why *I* am in hope that the lithograph will replace the black-and-white printed page. I predict that the literature of the future will be printed in the colors of nature. It will be in greens, blues, and other hues grateful to the human eye. If we ever have a permanent literature, it will probably be a yellow ink on a background of dark blue.

SIR O.—That seems to be a strange combination. Yet, now that I think of it, the color that carries radiance the greatest distance in nature is the yellow star backed by the blue of the heavens. It is not probable we would see one tenth of the stars, if their colors were blue or green.

MR. F.—I have read somewhere of a man who was losing his eyesight. A certain portion of his visual power failed him day by day. He tested the various

colors. The last he could see before his eyesight completely failed him was yellow. When subsequently he recovered sight the first color he could distinguish again was yellow. Sign painters instinctively put a gilt yellow letter on a black background, as this combination can be distinguished farther than any other.

NOTE.—The author of this work published two numbers of a magazine called *The Modern Thinker*. One of his objects was to call the attention of the public to the necessity for reform in our black-and-white printed literature. *The Modern Thinker* was a very bizarre-looking publication. Different colored inks and paper of different hues, some of them very incongruous, were used. The only colors not used were black ink and white paper. A fair sale resulted; but the author was engaged in daily journalism, and could not find time or strength to continue the publication. The color theory on which the magazine was printed at the time attracted no attention.

A WORD WITH A CRITIC.

SIR ORACLE.—My forecasting faculty has been busy in thinking out what you will say of my book, Mr. Critic. You will probably point out certain errors of fact. You will notice that I repeat myself, that the style is colloquial, and at times both inaccurate and inelegant. You will dispute my reasoning, and you will say—probably with some justice—that while I disavow having any Utopia, yet that unconsciously I have certain pet theories about religion, morals, economics, and politics, in conformity of which I predict the future of society. No doubt my readers will profit by what you gentlemen will set forth; but, after all, I question your competency, Mr. Critic, to say whether I am right or wrong in my forecasts. That must be left for final settlement to the generations that follow us. I should not be surprised if what seems to be my most eccentric notions should turn out to be correct, while the most obvious deductions from well-established facts may prove to be delusions and snares.

CRITIC.—Nothing you can now say will prevent my tribe from overhauling your work severely. You have ventured into a new and very difficult field, and we shall take it for granted that you were not properly equipped for your work. But certain people rush in where angels fear to tread, and you are one of them. You have pub-

lished a book which will be regarded as an ambitious attempt to accomplish the impossible, nor will you get any credit for your audacity. The mightiest changes in store for us are those which are unforeseen. Aristotle could point out the various forms of government; Plato could dream of an ideal republic; but if a Grecian inventor should tell either of these philosophers that the time would come when travellers would be transported at the rate of fifty miles an hour; that the lightning could be used to transmit intelligence so swiftly as practically to get rid of space and time; that men could converse with each other hundreds of miles apart, he would have been regarded as a lunatic. Man's mightiest triumphs have so far been over nature. The race itself, as a race, has made very little progress. Even our cultivated classes are not up to the average, physically or mentally, of the Grecian citizen of the age of Pericles. But what marvellous progress we have made in getting control over the forces of nature!

SIR O.—What you say is true enough, judged by the past; but I venture to predict that this same wonder-working science will direct its attention in the future to the improvement of man and his environment. Important as have been the results from the invention of gunpowder, steam, and communication by electricity, these are as nothing to what will be accomplished when the organized common-sense of the race is brought to bear to solve the problems connected with man's life on this planet. Of course, mechanical and other inventions will affect the physical conditions of men wonderfully, but the larger triumphs of science will be those which will add to the life, health, beauty, and happiness of the human race.

CRITIC.—*Apropos* of what you are saying permit me to direct your attention to a paragraph from a recent article published in *The Forum* for September, 1888, by Mr. James Parton. It is as follows:

The destiny of man is hemmed in on every side by hard conditions which can be mitigated, but not materially changed. We cannot escape the limitations of our lot, do what we will. If we who are now alive could return to life two thousand years from the present time, we should doubtless remark with pleasure many changes in the aspect of things and some decided improvements—perhaps fewer people and those better provided,—but we should certainly find that not one of the essential facts of human life had altered. Life would still be short, and nearly all of it spent in the mere business of prolonging itself. Man would still be weak and prone to error. The human race would still be poor. The lion would still have the lion's share. Rude strength would still push aside and stride past amiable weakness. There would still be in every well-disposed mind the old conflict between duty and inclination, between reason and prejudice, between the higher impulse and the lower propensity. Competition would still be the mainspring of the activity of men. Appearances would still deceive, and men would be both guided and misguided by their own experience. The two thousand years behind them would instruct and delude them as our last two thousand instruct and delude us. Lies crushed to earth would rise again, as they do now. Error a thousand times refuted would still prevail. Probably the world would be as like and as unlike its present condition as the age in which we live is like and unlike the age when Socrates was wise in Greece and Aristophanes burlesqued him. But in that future time June and October will still be enchanting months; Christmas will come in December; the high pleasures will still be cheap and accessible; and a person of good sense will still be able to pick his way through life with some comfort and much enjoyment, besides adding a little to the general weal.

SIR O.—I wish I could write as well as Mr. Parton; but I am afraid he is becoming discouraged in his old age. He started out full of reformatory zeal, but man's

life is short, and our noblest ideals rarely survive middle age. I am not afraid to assert that before the expiration of the two thousand years spoken of by Mr. Parton there will be mighty changes on this planet of ours. Man will have penetrated into and utilized all its waste places. The population of the earth will be very dense; life will be prolonged, and disease will be scarcely known. The whole globe will be under one government, the labor question will be solved satisfactorily, and the relations of the sexes will be so adjusted as to conduce to human happiness.

CRITIC.—So the truth comes out at last! You have a Utopia. You do believe in a millennium! Still you cannot deny that there is many a bloody and shameful page of human history yet to be written. Myriads of human beings will live lives of misery. Is it not true that a summing-up of all the horrors yet to be experienced by the children of men would be so terrible, if it could be realized, as to make one feel like committing suicide to get rid of so hateful an existence?

SIR O.—Nevertheless, I believe most profoundly in the final triumph of good over evil. As yet, all is chaos, but the duty of every human being is to help hasten the day when man and his environment will be brought into harmonious relations with each other.

THE END.